NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

L. MARIA CHILD, Editor. | Without Concealment----Without Compromise. | DAVID LEE CHILD, Assistant Editor.

VOLUME III.---NO. 32. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1843. | WHOLE NUMBER 136.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At 143, Nassau Street, New-York.

☞ All remittances, and letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper, should be addressed to ISAAC T. HOPPER.

☞ Letters relating to the editorial department should be addressed to L. MARIA CHILD.

TERMS.—$2,00 a year, in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10,00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1,50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post Office Department:—"A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

THE COVENANT WITH JUDAS.

Extract from a Sermon preached by John Pierpont, in application to the famous Latimer case, in Boston.

"They covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver."
Matthew xxvi. 15.

4. The case brought under our notice in the text, the *covenant* between the chief priests, as one party, and Judas Iscariot as the other, differs in this point from all those already considered; namely—it was not understood by either party as a religious act, like that of Jeptha; nor was it exactly an oath, like that of Herod, or like that of the Jews conspiring to kill Paul; nor, like this last, was it without consideration; for here, the consideration paid and received was, "thirty pieces of silver." But does a difference in this point make a difference in the moral character of the act covenanted for? We have seen that a covenant or promise, with *no* consideration, is void. Does a consideration, *worse* than none, make it other than void? "The civilians hold," says the great commentator upon English law, already quoted, "that in all contracts, either express or implied, there must be something given in exchange, something that is mutual and reciprocal. This thing, which is the price or motive of the contract, we call the *consideration*: and it must be a thing *lawful in itself*, or else the contract is *void*."* In fact, no principle in law is better established than this, that a corrupt or immoral consideration so thoroughly vitiates a contract or covenant, that, as between the parties themselves, it can never be purged. And this is law all over the world. If, in the streets of Rome or Naples, I hire an assassin to do his work, on credit, I am under no obligation to pay him when it is done. If I pay him in advance, he is under no obligation to do the work. No solemnity of form, no amount of consideration, can sanctify the compact, or make it binding upon the soul of either party. Indeed, so universally is this truth admitted, that it has passed into a proverb, that "a bad promise is better broken than kept."

If need were, the high authority of our Great Master might be appealed to, in support of the position which has been taken, and which I am endeavoring to defend in this discourse. The Saviour does not indeed mention any specific instance of a vow, sinful in itself, and therefore void. But he takes notice of, and pointedly condemns a practice, at the bottom of which lay the same corrupt popular sentiment, which, even in our own day, has done so much to give a practical validity to vows and covenants, in themselves immoral. This was, the practice, on the part of children, of devoting to God, as a religious offering, what they ought to apply to the support of their aged and helpless parents; thus, by their tradition, making of none effect the commands of God, "Honor thy father and mother," and "Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death."

This is "making thorough work." It is going to the bottom of the whole matter. For, if I may not bind myself, by a vow, to give up even to God, i. e. if I may not, without sin, devote to *pious uses*, that which is my own, when, in doing so, I withhold from another, that to which he has a natural right; much less can I, without sin, bind myself, by a covenant, vow, or oath, to give up, to *impious* uses, that which is *not* my own. And, if I cannot bind *myself* to do this, by my own covenant or oath, *a fortiori*, another cannot bind me to do it, by covenanting for me that I shall.

This brings us directly upon the case that is now regarded with such intense interest in this community.

A man—a creature of God, made in His image—a child of God, as much as any one of us is—who *was* a slave in Virginia, and, by the laws of that State, held to be a chattel—a *thing*—has been brought out of his house of bondage, and stands here, upon Massachusetts ground, and breathes Massachusetts air, in sight of the monument that stands on Bunker's Hill, to tell where Massachusetts men poured out their life-blood in the cause of liberty. He is pursued by a man, who calls himself his *owner*. He is hunted down by slavery's minions in Boston; is seized, and cast into a Boston jail; where, by direction of the Virginian, not even the ministers of Jesus Christ are allowed to "come unto him;" though, in the humane spirit—nay, by the letter—of Massachusetts law, they are allowed to visit a prisoner, whose hands are reeking with his brother's blood. His pursuer demands that he be given up. Will he be? I suppose, he will. On what ground? By virtue of a *covenant*, which, it is *said*, our fathers made with the Virginian's fathers, that, in such cases, the fugitive *should* be given up.

Here, then, two inquiries present themselves.

First, IS IT SO?

Secondly, WHAT IF IT IS SO?

First, *Is it so?* I place myself, by supposition, upon the judgment-seat, with a religious sense of my responsibleness to God and to man, for the present and all future ages, for time and eternity: and I ask, *Is this so?* In reply, I say,—If it is so, it can be proved to be so, by inspection of the covenant itself. Let me look at it. I am told that it is found in the third clause of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States. I look at the clause, and find that it provides for the surrender of "*persons held to service or labor in one State*, under the laws thereof, escaping into another;" but this is, by no means, conclusive against a man in the position of the party before me. Nay, so far as the letter of the covenant is concerned, it does not raise even a presumption against him. That clause contains a description, which embraces persons or classes totally distinct from slaves; a description, moreover, which, in some of its points, is utterly inapplicable to a slave. It provides for the case of a minor, who escapes from the control and service of his parent; for that of an apprentice, who escapes from the service due to his master, in consideration of the instruction that his master gives him, in the art or mystery of which he is an apprentice; for that of an emigrant from abroad, who is held, by his own contract, to repay, by his service or labor, the money advanced by another for his conveyance to our shores; nay, even for the case of a minister of the gospel, who is held, personally, to the service of his people, by his own contract, but who deserts his flock, and withdraws into another State, leaving his sheep to the wolves. All these persons are fugitives from justice—from the demands of natural right, and, therefore, of the moral law; whereas, the man before me is a fugitive from injustice. Justice has no claims upon him. And, as this clause of the Constitution immediately follows a clause, which provides for the surrender of other fugitives from justice—offenders, that is, against criminal law—I conclude that the intention of the framers of the Constitution was, in the one clause, for graver, and, in the other, for minor offenses against natural law.

I then look still further; and, though I see that the framers of the Constitution have carefully abstained from laying the word *slave* upon the face of that instrument, they have, in another part of it, enumerated several *other* classes of persons, among which are, "free persons, including *those bound to service for a term of years*"—a description, so nearly identical with that in the clause, relied upon in the present case, that, if I construe one part of the instrument by another, as, by the laws of construction, I am bound to do, I have good reason to believe that they meant the same sort of persons, in the one case as in the other. And this inference is fortified by the fact that, in the clause last cited, by common admission, and by practice under the Constitution ever since its adoption, slaves are brought in under the phrase "other persons." Slaves, then, in the language of the Constitution, are "other persons" than such as are described, in one place, as "persons bound to service for a term of years," and, in the other, as "persons held to service or labor." If, then, slaves are other persons than these, they are not these persons.

This construction is favored—nay, it is demonstrably enforced, by the closing words of the clause appealed to, which provides that the persons therein described "shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be *due*." Now, all duties, or *dues*, result, as has been shown, from the natural relations; those in which, according to the laws and ordinances of God, men stand to each other. But the relation of owner and slave is not a natural relation. No duty, then, can result from it. *Nothing can be* DUE *from a slave to his holder*. I ask the party making this claim, by what law, the service of the party claimed is *due* to him? Does he say, "By the laws of Virginia"? I reply, Those laws are of no force in Massachusetts. Does he say, "By the laws of the United States"?—I answer, Show me the law, declaring that the service or labor of the slave is *due* to his owner.—Does he say, "By the Constitution of the United States?" I answer, You beg the question. Does he say, "By the law of nature"? I answer, By that law your service and labor, or your money, is due to *him*, in consideration of his liberty, which you have wrongfully taken from him, and of the labor and services, which you have wrung from him, for years, and the wages for which "is, of you, kept back by fraud." If, therefore, you appeal to the law of nature, you will find that, instead of that man's service or labor being due to you, yours are due to him.

And once more: I look at the preamble of the Constitution, the part, that is, which declares its object, its final cause, the purpose for which it was framed. Among other objects, is this—"to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Now, not only am I bound, as a minister of justice, in all cases of doubtful meaning, to give the language of the law such a construction as shall favor natural right; and in all cases, where the life or liberty of a man is in question, to give it such a construction as shall favor life and liberty; for both which reasons, I must construe the clause, here in question, in favor of the freedom of the party claimed; but I am also bound, to give to every legal instrument such a construction as to make all the parts of it harmonious; so as to give validity to the whole instrument; *ut res magis valeat quam pereat*; and not so to construe one part of it as to make it destroy another. But, if I construe the clause in question so as to give this claimant his demand, I give it a construction which is in direct conflict with the preamble. I make the means defeat the end; and, instead of making the Constitution, which I have sworn to support, a means of securing the "blessings of liberty" to the people of the United States, I make it the means of securing the curse of slavery to one-sixth part of those people, and the concomitant curses of it to all the rest. If, then, I give this clause the construction that shall deliver up one of the men before me, as the slave of the other, I violate a fundamental law, observed in the construction of all laws; I make the laws of man paramount to the laws of God, in that I construe this instrument against natural right; and, at the same time, I put one part of it, which provides the means, in direct antagonism with another, which sets forth the end, proposed to be effected by the instrument itself. Judgment must, therefore, be against the man who claims the other as his slave, under this instrument, unless he can show, *aliunde*, that it was the intention of the framers of it to uphold slavery, by the very document, which, they declare, they are framing as a security to freedom; in other words, that, on one page, they go about to break down, what, on another, they declare that they have set about building up.

Can this be shown? There is a strong antecedent probability against it. The evidence to sustain such a position, therefore, must be proportionably clear and strong. It may be sought for, and it *may* be found, in the reports that have come down to us of the deliberations, debates, and other doings of the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States. I know not that it is impossible to draw, from any such sources, the evidence which the case demands; but, till it is produced, if I am told that the Constitution of the United States provides that *slaves*, escaping from a State where they were held as such, and coming into this State, shall be given up, on demand of the owner; and if I am asked, "*Is it not so?*" I reply, In my judgment, *it is not*. But—and this brings us to the other of the two questions just proposed; viz:

Secondly, *What if it is so?* To this I answer:—Even if it *is* so—if it is clearly proved that this *was* the intention and understanding of the framers of the Constitution, then, I say that that provision, being against natural right, and, consequently, in derogation of a higher law, and requiring me to do what God forbids me to do, is of no binding force whatever, but is utterly void. This particular covenant—for the Constitution of the United States is a covenant, or, rather, a number of covenants, entered into by the people of the United States, each with all the rest—must come under the law of all human covenants, compacts or agreements, in this, that it is of no binding force, if it is contrary to the laws of God. The consideration that a constitution is the act of a convention, and an ordinary law, an act of a congress; that the former is called the fundamental law, laying at the foundation of the government, or of the Union, does not alter its moral character. There is a government that hath still deeper foundations—foundations, that under-lie those of any human government, and on which, alone, the soul of man can build up for itself an "everlasting habitation." Says Sir William Blackstone—"Man, considered as a creature, must *necessarily* be subject to the laws of his Creator, for he is entirely a dependent being. A being independent of any other, has no rule to pursue, but such as he prescribes to himself; but a state of dependence will inevitably oblige the inferior to take the will of him, on whom he depends, as the rule of his conduct: not, indeed, in every particular, but in all those points wherein his dependence consists. This principle, therefore, has more or less extent and effect, in proportion as the superiority of the one, and the dependence of the other, is greater or less, absolute or limited. And, consequently, as man depends absolutely upon his Maker for everything, it is necessary that he should, in all points, conform to his Maker's will. The will of his Maker is called 'the law of nature.'" And "this law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding all over the globe, in all countries, and at all times. *No human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this.*" Lord Chief Justice Hobart, too, holds that "even an act of parliament, made against natural justice, is void in itself, for the laws of nature are immutable, and are *leges legum*, the laws to whose authority all other laws must give place." I am aware that Mr. Christian differs in opinion, on this point, with Mr. Justice Blackstone, and Chief Justice Hobart. He conceives "that, in no case whatever, can a judge oppose his opinion and authority to the clear will and declaration of the legislature. His province is, to interpret and obey the mandates of the supreme power of the State. And, if an act of parliament, if we could suppose such a case, should, like the edict of Herod, command all the children under a certain age to be slain, the judge ought to resign his office, rather than be auxiliary in its execution; but it could only be declared void by the same legislative power by which it was ordained." But this cannot be true doctrine, especially in this country, where no one doubts the authority of the bench to declare an act of the legislature void, for that it is against the Constitution. This, as I understand, was lately done by the Supreme Court of the United States, in regard to a part of a law of Congress, touching the very clause of the Constitution now under consideration. That part of an act of Congress was declared void, because in conflict with the Constitution of the United States—a higher law. On the same principle, the clause of the Constitution now in question, if it *must* be so construed as to demand the delivering up of a fugitive slave, must be declared void, because it is clearly in conflict with a higher law, the CONSTITUTION OF MAN, and the law of the SUPREME POWER OF THE UNIVERSE.

"No human laws," says Blackstone, again, "should be suffered to contradict these. To instance in the case of murder:—this is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law: and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. Those human laws, that annex a punishment to it, do not at all increase its moral guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation in *foro conscientiæ* to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, *we are* BOUND *to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.*"

This is as true as Truth herself. Nothing on earth can shake this position. Now, then, let us reason from it. "If *any* human law should allow or enjoin murder, we are bound to transgress that law." But the Constitution of the United States *is* a human law. Should it enjoin murder, which, is, the taking away of a man's life, in violation of a natural or divine law, we are *bound* to transgress that Constitution. Now, the claimant, in this case, says, and for the sake of argument, I admit, that the Constitution enjoins me to aid him in kidnapping, which is, the taking away of another man's liberty, in violation of a natural or divine law. Then I am *bound* to transgress that Constitution. All writers on natural law admit our Declaration of Independence, and many of our State constitutions expressly declare, that a man's natural right to his liberty is as clear as his natural right to his life. Which is the greater blessing, I am not called upon, in this case, to decide. But I know, that thousands of the noblest of our revolutionary fathers and patriots judged, that life without liberty was not worth the holding: and especially do the words of one of the most eloquent of Virginia's own sons continually ring in my ear. "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of *chains and slavery?* Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!"

If, then, the clause of the Constitution that is appealed to, by the claimant in this case, *does* enjoin it upon me, as a judge, to deliver up the man before me to Virginia's "chains and slavery." I feel myself bound by a higher law—by the authority of the Judge of all judges—to declare that clause of the Constitution of no binding force before this tribunal; and the judgment of this court is, that the prisoner be discharged.

Before leaving the bench, upon which I have supposed myself to be sitting, I must dispose of a few objections that may be urged, in opposition to the judgment just pronounced.

1. I am reminded, that, as a judge, I have sworn to support the Constitution of the United States.

I reply, first, I swore to support the Constitution according to *my* understanding of it: not according to yours, or any other man's. And I have already given it as my understanding of the clause in question, that it never was intended by the framers of the instrument to provide for the delivering up of a fugitive *slave*; but, that it was intended to apply to fugitives from justice; that is, the just claims or demands of citizens in another State. And, thus understood, my present judgment does support the Constitution.

And I answer, secondly—admitting that the present claimant's construction of the clause in question is the true one;—nay, admitting that I so understood it when I took my oath, and that I so understand it now;—it only follows that my *oath* is void. It was taken in sin; and, if performed, would be so in a still greater sin.

"'Tis a great sin to swear unto a sin;
But greater sin to keep a sinful oath."*

2. I am told that this part of the Constitution of the United States was a *compromise* between the friends of freedom at the North, and those of slavery, at the South.

Answer, 1. Admit it. It was a *sinful* compromise; a compromise that the delegates, in neither interest, had any right to make; a compromise, on the part of the North, of *moral principle*; a compromise void, for its immorality, even as to the contracting parties themselves; and, if possible, still more void as to all who shall come after them. It was just the compromise that Judas made with the chief priests. Each party was anxious to get something that he had not got. The chief priests would gladly keep their money, and get their victim too; but their victim they must have, at all events. Judas would gladly hold fast his integrity; but, at any rate, the chief priests' money he must have. The one party gave up their money to get their victim; the other gave up his integrity and his Saviour, to get the money. This was the compromise, in the one case. In the other case—admitting the compromise—both parties were desirous of the Union. The South had her slavery, the North her integrity. But these could not co-exist, if the Union was effected. There was a natural incompatibility between them. One or the other must be laid upon the altar of the Union. *Which* should be given up as the sacrifice? Certainly not our slavery, said the South—let the Union go, rather than that. Well, then, said the North, rather than not get the Union, let our integrity go. That was the compromise in the other case:—IF it is a fact, which I do not admit, except for the sake of argument, but on the contrary,

2. And in the second place, I *deny*. For, it is essential to a compromise, between two parties, that something should be given up by each. What was given up by the South? On the construction contended for, she got the Union—a thing much more essential to her than to the North. She held fast to her slavery, and secured a new guaranty to it, by binding the freemen of the North to be her slave-catchers and whippers-in, for all future time!

3. Once more, it is said that this stipulation or provision in favor of southern slavery, was a *sine qua non*, a condition without which the slave States would never have come into the Union.

Answer 1st. Then let them have stayed out.

2d. How is that known?—How can it be known? Who is it that has such a knowledge of the *possible* result of the deliberations of such minds as were in the convention of the framers of the Constitution of the United States—deliberations held under the pressing exigencies of that period—as to enable him to say what result could, and what could not, have been reached, without a sacrifice of moral principle? But, even if it were so: if, instead of a convention of patriots, it had been a convention of prophets, that framed the Constitution, and those old seers had distinctly seen that, without a provision that should make the northmen slave hunters for the South, the present Union would *never* have been formed;—*could* a worse destiny have awaited the *disunited* colonies, under the British crown, than to have, within the life of man, from that moment, as many human beings as then breathed American air, bound in the chains of absolute slavery; and thrice as many more, so much more degraded and debased, than the slaves themselves, as to consent to be converted into *iron*, and worked up into *tools*—vises and hammers—to fasten on those chains? *A ruinous price does he pay for his civil liberty, who, to purchase it, gives himself up the bondslave at once of sinners and of sin!*

My friends and brethren, I have supposed myself an incumbent, for a time, of the judgment-seat, before which a fellow-man is to be brought, whose condition as a freeman or a slave is to be fixed by my decision. I have given you my judgment, and stand now before you, not a magistrate, but a minister of Jesus Christ; feeling the responsibleness that lies on me as such, to you, to my profession, to my country, and to God. I have spoken, and will yet speak, freely, on this subject at this crisis: for I feel as the great statesman of our own city felt, more than twenty years ago, when standing by Plymouth rock, and, speaking of the very work which is now going on in the temples of justice and the prisons of this city—namely, the catching, chaining, and dooming to hopeless slavery of our fellow-men—he said,—"I hear the sound of the hammer. I see the smoke of the furnaces, where manacles and fetters are forged for human limbs. I see the visages of those who, by stealth, and at midnight, labor in this work of hell, foul and dark as may become the artificers of such instruments of misery and torture. * * * I would invoke those who fill the seats of justice, and all who minister at the altar, that they administer the wholesome and necessary severity of the law. I invoke the ministers of religion, that they proclaim its denunciation of these crimes, and add its solemn sanctions to the authority of human laws. If the pulpit be silent, whenever or wherever there may be a sinner, bloody with this guilt, within the hearing of its voice, that pulpit is false to its trust."* I know that this was spoken with special reference to the foreign slave trade. But I know, too, that, foreign or domestic, sin is sin. I know that God's laws take, within their compass, all latitudes and all longitudes; that they sweep over all seas and all lands alike; regarding the enslaving of man with no more favor in Boston than in Congo; and pronouncing the panders of this sin no less guilty, when sitting on a judgment-seat, than when standing on a slaver's deck. I know that a man cannot take himself out of the hand of these laws, by swearing that they shall not hold him;—that he cannot shake them off, by his oath that he *will*; and, however it may appear to the moral vision of other men, to mine, the morality that requires and compels me to deliver up a fellow-man to chains and torture—to hopeless slavery, if not to death, because others have covenanted for me that I shall do so, and because of my own oath that I will keep that covenant;—is, essentially, the morality of a Judas, who would deliver up the Son of Man to be scourged and crucified, because he had *covenanted to do so*;—the morality of a Herod, who, *for his oath's sake*, would murder a prophet of God;—the morality of the female fiend of the great English dramatist, who says of herself—

——"I have given suck, and know
How tender 'tis, to love the babe that milks me:
I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have pluck'd my nipple from its boneless gums,
And dashed the brains out, *had I so but sworn*,
As you have done to this."†

I am aware that this is not popular doctrine. I know that the current of public sentiment, in the great thoroughfares of business, and along the channels of commerce, sets strongly against it. I know that in the eyes, of the many—yea, and of the mighty—the Constitution of these United States is supreme;—that it over-rides God's laws, and that *it* must stand, though *they* be trodden under foot. But it is the object of this discourse to lift up God's law, to make it honorable in my hearers' eyes, and to make even the highest of human ordinances to do it homage. Though State may league with State, and millions covenant with millions more, to sustain a wrong, they cannot hold it up. Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished. Even yet, "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

I would not, indeed, reproach the noble band of patriots, who framed the Constitution of the United States. I would not willingly believe that they deserve the reproach that is cast upon them by those who hold, that, into the great charter of our country's freedom, they covertly inwrought the charter of perpetual slavery, for themselves and their posterity. But, even if they did,—if the proof that they did were ever so overwhelming,—though I may feel myself afflicted on being compelled to admit it—

"And, sad as angels, at a good man's sin,
Weep to record, and blush to give it in!"

Yet, even then, that charter shall have no binding force upon my soul. If, by both the letter and the spirit of that covenant, they meant to bind me to do the slaveholder's work, and minister to his sin, I cannot forget the word of the Lord, which he spake by his servant Moses: "Thou shalt *not* deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee."‡ Nor can I forget *my* Master's words: "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me;" and I shall regard their covenant, in that particular, as utterly null and void. If, on my heavenward journey, I see even the Constitution of the United States standing in my path, like the visionary ladder of the patriarch, it shall not hinder—it shall help me on my way; for I will mount upward by treading it under my feet.

My brethren, much as we may venerate our fathers, we must venerate still more the rights of man, and his Maker's laws. Though we may reverently cherish their memory, and jealously guard their fame, we must not forget that there is One, whose authority is higher than theirs; and, if it be true that, in the laws which they made for us, they have required us to do anything, so incompatible with the commands of the Most High, that we *cannot* obey them both, I most seriously ask you, Which *shall* we obey—our dead fathers? or, our LIVING GOD?

* Daniel Webster's oration at Plymouth, 1820.
† Macbeth, act i. scene vii.
‡ Deut. xxiii. 15.

* Blackstone's Commentaries, II. 444.

* Pericles, Prince of Tyre; Act V. Scene 3.

From the British Anti-Slavery Reporter.

ASHBURTON TREATY.—THE TENTH ARTICLE.

PLAYFORD HALL, Oct. 24th, 1842.

My Dear Friend, John Beaumont,—I have looked into the tenth article of the late treaty with the United States, and I will now give you the result of my thoughts upon it. It was necessary for the American government, considering the great extent of the boundary line, and the number of American *white* ruffians who had taken advantage of it to escape the punishment due to their crimes by flying beyond it—it was necessary, I repeat, to have an article of this sort; and I believe, therefore, that the American government, and Lord Ashburton, too, had no other object in view than to cause the surrender of such white subjects as were criminals: but I am decidedly of opinion that the American slaveholders will take advantage of this article, not only to go into Canada with their claims as before, but to go more frequently—for the article says, that the proper authorities on both sides (British and American) shall *deliver up all persons* who, being charged with *certain crimes*, shall seek an asylum in the territories of each other. Now the words "*all persons*," evidently include the black (*slave*) as well as the white population. The words are qualified, however, or restricted in their meaning, by being made to relate only to those fugitives who have committed *certain crimes*. There is no article in the treaty which allows a fugitive slave to be given up *merely* for *running away*. Running away is *no crime*, according to the treaty, unless *actual crime* is the cause of it. Let us now see what those crimes are for which a criminal may be surrendered. They are six in number. 1. Murder. 2. Assault, with intent to commit murder. 3. Arson. 4. Piracy. 5. Robbery. 6. Forgery. Now I think it is evident by this catalogue of crimes that the American president has in view the *white population* only, for I never heard of arson, piracy, (according to our definition of it,) or forgery, being committed by slaves. Indeed they cannot commit *forgery*, because there is only here and there a slave who can read or write. I wish it may be that this was the design of the American president, for then things will remain, with respect to Canada, as they were before the treaty; and it becomes our government, or Lord Ashburton, to inquire whether the American president views the treaty in this light. If it is meant to include the *slave* population, then the treaty will be most disastrous; for though the slaves do not commit some of the crimes specified, yet they are guilty of *petty thefts*. Now, does the word *robbery* include petty thefts? If it does, then the door is open to claims without end—to thousands of applications. I am of opinion, then, if the treaty takes in the slave population, that the slave owners, encouraged by the case of Nelson Hackett, and having *now* a *legal right* to make claims, which they had not before, will pester our government in Canada with *thousands* of applications (considering that the fugitives now in Canada amount to 12,000 souls:) indeed, that they will not be able to get through the business without establishing a special court for the purpose of trying the cases which will be brought before them. And such a court, if established, would have many and great difficulties to contend with. Lies without end would be told without scruple by the pursuers of the fugitive, to get him into their possession. Ask a Canadian who lives on the British borders of Canada, what he thinks of these claims, as far as they have come within his own knowledge, and he will tell you that he will not believe a word of what these pursuers have to say. The crimes with which they charge the fugitives are mostly fabricated. It may be that a fugitive is now and then a criminal, but ninety-nine in a hundred run away *solely* to gain their liberty and avoid oppression.

I come now to the way in which the reputed criminal is to be dealt with. He is to be brought before a judge, or other magistrate, of the territory in which said reputed criminal shall be found, who shall have power, jurisdiction, and authority, upon complaint made under oath, to issue a warrant for the apprehension of the fugitive or person "charged with crime, to the end that the evidence against him may be heard and considered; and if it be found that the evidence of criminality be such as would justify his apprehension and commitment," he is to certify the same to the executive, that a warrant may issue for the surrender of such fugitive. The expense of apprehension and delivery to be defrayed by the pursuers.

Now, if it should be that the slave population is included in the treaty, (which our government ought to know before parliament meets,) it becomes them to take measures to render the treaty innocuous, as far as the unhappy fugitives who have fled to our territories for protection are concerned, considering the dreadful punishment which awaits a runaway slave. Woe to that poor creature who is given up to an enraged master! It becomes Lord Ashburton, (and I think, as a just and humane man, he would be pleased to do it,) to persuade our government, who sent him out to make the treaty, to do all they can to frustrate the designs of these hunters after blood. 1st, It strikes me, that applications for the restoration of fugitives will be so numerous, seeing that there are nearly three millions of slaves in the United States, all ready to run away as opportunity offers, that, to get through the business of a just adjudication, our government should establish a special court of justice for these trials. 2d, That they should sit once in every month. 3d, That they should appoint counsel *to defend the fugitive*. 4th, That the latter should be allowed to tell his own tale throughout, as evidence against his pursuers. 5th, That particular instructions should be given to get a satisfactory proof of the *identity* of person, seeing so many black people are alike. 6th, To have a clear understanding with the president, and this immediately, what is to be understood by the word "*robbery*." Should it include every *petty theft*, it *ought to be altered* or abolished; and it may *be altered* on the *soundest principles of law*. No civilized man would desire that crimes of a serious nature should go unpunished, or that the offender who committed them should not be delivered up to justice; but all wise and virtuous legislators have proportioned the punishment to the offense. Now, what would be the punishment of a fugitive slave for petty theft, if given up to an exasperated master, who has arbitrary power to punish in his own hands, and who would add to the crime committed, the *crime* of running away? He may torture him to death; he may starve him to death, in a dungeon; he may whip him to death, *as has been frequently done*; he may cut off a limb with an axe, as *has been actually done* before; and, if he were brought to trial before a public court of slaveholders, they might sentence him to be burnt alive, and there *is no remedy against any such punishment*. The tortures which slaves have undergone for *merely running away* are too shocking to be described, and would not be believed, unless there was such evidence as it would be impossible to doubt. The liability, therefore, to such punishments for petty thefts, to which would be always added the crime of running away, ought not to be admitted into the treaty, and this may, *consistently with justice*, be *got rid of*, on the *principle* acknowledged by all legislators, that these *punishments are not proportioned to the offense*; and I hope, when the treaty comes before parliament for ratification, that parliament will not sanction it as it now stands, unless there should be some previous understanding from the president himself, that the treaty was never intended *to include in it slaves*. Perhaps they may think it right to do away the tenth article altogether.

I will now give you a very short history of this little colony, to show you that the poor people it contains, are worthy both of our sympathy and our protection. Some years ago, a few poor slaves fled from the cruelty of their masters in the United States, not knowing whither they were going; but it turned out, after much wandering, they found themselves in Canada; and being received with kindness by the inhabitants, they settled there. This circumstance at length became known to other slaves in the southern States of America, and there was, of course, a desire to repair to the same spot, for the same purpose. Several attempted the journey, many of whom perished in the woods; for they dare not travel by the common roads for fear of being seen, others, (for all of them were pursued,) were taken, and carried back by their masters, by whose order they were punished in a most cruel manner, to deter others from following their example. I would not wound your feelings by any account of what they suffered in the perilous attempt to escape—hunger and thirst, sickness and death, on the route. Such an account would be most heart-rending. Suffice it to say, that, after a given time, as many as five or six thousand found their way to this asylum of liberty, and, being in such numbers, they sent a deputation to our government, to entreat that they might be suffered to remain in Canada. I was in London when the deputation arrived, and I understood from them that their prayer was granted. Since that time (their numbers still increasing by the addition of fresh fugitives,) they have built huts or cottages, cultivated the land, erected a place of worship, and established schools; and they have been so industrious, honest, and sober, and in short had conducted themselves in such an orderly and peaceable manner, as to have gained the good will, and respect, and esteem of all their neighbors. They sent deputations again twice in the last eight or nine years, to London, not to trouble the government, but to try to raise contributions in England for schoolmasters for their children. I know this, because I myself contributed twice to their funds for this purpose. I may now add that, at this time, their number amounts to about 12,000, and it is believed that full that number have been lost, either by being taken, or perishing in the attempt to escape. These people then, were living comfortably, and happily, and, without the fear of ever being restored to slavery, when, in the present year, certain persons from the United States came within the boundaries of Canada, to demand the restoration of Nelson Hackett to the authorities of Arkansas, being an alledged fugitive from justice. The persons who came upon this errand brought with them regular papers, having the appearance of being correctly made out, and presented them to the authorities in Canada; the consequence of which was, that the governor-general did, on the 17th of January, surrender the said Nelson Hacket to be delivered up to the executive of Arkansas. This step created a great sensation in that part of Canada where it took place. The poor fugitives settled there were seized with terror lest it should be their turn next, after all their sufferings, to be delivered up to their blood-thirsty masters; and the heads of the population of the place were so interested in their behalf, that they met together, and passed resolutions, to be presented to the governor-general, to prevent for the future, as they say, "such wicked and dangerous proceedings."

And now, my dear friend, if the tenth article should include the slave as well as the free population, and if it should be ratified by parliament, you may depend upon it that one poor fugitive after another will be picked out by the slave hunters of the United States, and claimed; and thus this noble colony of poor, but industrious and honest men, will be frittered away by degrees, and lost to this country forever. And is it of no consequence to our national character, as well as our interests, that such a colony should be broken up? that their chapels, schools, and cottages should be left to go to ruin; and that their little farms and gardens, put into cultivation with so much labor, should become a wilderness again? This colony amounts already to 12,000 souls, and in a few years would probably double its numbers, and, if I may credit my last letters from America, treble it. They already consume our manufactures, and would consume them to a greater extent as they increased in numbers by fresh fugitives, and by births. Is this a matter of no consideration to us? Is it not again, of some consequence, amidst the disaffection which prevails in Canada, to have a little colony attached to this country by gratitude, which would show their loyalty to us, and go through fire and water to serve us? But I will say no more on this subject than *fiat justitia ruat cælum*. It was a law of Moses, by the divine command, that a fugitive slave should not be returned to his master. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which has escaped from his master unto thee." (Exodus xxiii. 15). I am sure that Lord Ashburton would not be easy in his mind if this little colony should be broken up, and the inhabitants of it, by his own act, should be delivered again into slavery.

I remain, my dear friend, yours affectionately,
(Signed) THOMAS CLARKSON.

AMERICAN THEOLOGY AND DEMOCRACY.

The Rev. Alexander *M'Cain* has published a speech of twenty-eight pages, delivered before the general conference of the Methodist Protestant church, 1842, entitled, "SLAVERY DEFENDED FROM SCRIPTURE, *Against the attacks of the Abolitionists.*" Will the *Reverend* author never hear the voice of the Lord, inquiring "*Cain!* Cain! where is thy brother?"

A copy of this work was sent to Mr. Calhoun, who answered as follows. We recommend his reply to his *democratic* bretheren, who wish to place him at the head of this republic.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 3, 1842.

My Dear Sir.—I have read with pleasure your pamphlet, entitled, "Slavery defended from Scripture, Against the attacks of the Abolitionists."

You have fully and ably made good that title. You have shown, beyond all controversy, that slavery is sanctioned both by the Old and New Testament. He who denies it, if not blinded by fanaticism, must be a hypocrite.

I trust your pamphlet will have a wide circulation. It is calculated to do good, not only in repelling the assaults of the designing and fanatical, on our institutions, but also by confirming the South in its determination of upholding them.

A mysterious Providence has thought proper to bring together, in that portion of the Union, two races, in nearly equal numbers, from different continents, and of the most opposite color and character, of any two on the globe. They have lived together under the present relation, for more than two centuries, in peace and prosperity, with the greatest improvement of the inferior race, physically, intellectually, and morally, and without deterioration to the superior. They cannot be separated; nor can they live under any other. Destroy it, and one or the other must be subjected or expelled. Safety, patriotism, and duty command us, then, to maintain it at all hazard; and in obeying their mandate, you have shown that we have the high and holy sanction of scripture, despite the fury of the fanatic, or the hypocrisy of the designing.

I regret that unavoidable engagements prevented me from tendering at an earlier period my thanks for your pamphlet.

With great respect, I am, &c.
J. C. CALHOUN.

REV. ALEXANDER MCCAINE.

From the Watchman of the Valley.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

"At peace with all the world—the personal liberty of the citizens sacredly maintained, and his rights secured under political institutions deriving all their authority from the direct sanction of the people—with a soil fertile almost beyond example; and a country blessed with every diversity of climate and production, what remains to be done in order to advance the happiness and prosperity of such a people?"

This language is addressed by the President to the representatives of the people of the United States in Congress assembled; and it is couched under the form of an interrogation, as though it were undeniably true. Let us examine for a moment into the truth of the proposition. As the President is a slaveholder, he probably did not intend to include the three millions of slaves; they are not *citizens*, but *things*. Things for all purposes but that of determining the ratio of representation in Congress; in which case, by a sort of political alchemy, they suddenly become transmuted into *persons*. To whom, then, did he refer? No doubt to the *free* constituents of the representatives he addressed. Well, let us see. Among these representatives are found the forty members from the State of New-York, who are chosen in part by the suffrages of *free colored electors*, many of whom are found, at each election in New-York, exercising their right of suffrage. Suppose, then, that one of these electors, in the pursuit of a lawful business, should visit Louisiana; would "his personal liberty be sacredly maintained?" Certainly not. He would be imprisoned like a felon, not for crime, but because it happened that, with his four-fifths of Anglo-Saxon blood, one-fifth of African was mingled! He has no personal liberty in Louisiana, none, although he be a free elector of the State of New-York. Again; suppose he should visit the national capital, perhaps to transact business with the very representative elected by his vote. Is his personal liberty secure? He might consider himself fortunate, if, after a long imprisonment *on suspicion of being a slave*, he should escape without being sold into perpetual slavery for the payment of his jail fees!

In view of these facts, let the reader decide whether the liberties and rights of the citizens are sacredly maintained and secured, and whether there does not remain something "to be done in order to advance the happiness and prosperity of *such a people*."

ARISTIDES.

EXTRACT.

From the Message of Governor Bouck, of New-York, referring to existing relations between New-York and Virginia.

It cannot be denied that there has always been a class of men in the United States, who have been disposed to give to the government a strong tendency towards consolidation. While I would not impugn their motives, I cannot withhold the expression of my deliberate opinion, that they labor under a great and dangerous error. Nothing can be gained to the federal government by exercising powers which have not been plainly delegated to it. On the contrary, I am firmly persuaded that nothing short of the complete sovereignty of the States, in all matters where they have not clearly surrendered their rights to the general government, can give strength and stability to the Union, and secure in perpetuity the blessings we so richly enjoy. And as I love the Union, I would firmly resist every usurpation of power on the part of the national government.

While we are thus careful to watch and defend

the advantages of the Union, we are bound by every consideration of honor and good faith to yield to others what we demand for ourselves—an honest fulfillment of the compact by which, for many purposes, we are made one people.

I have been led to this course of remark from the tendency which has been noticed to strengthen the national arm at the expense of the several States, and from finding upon our statute books laws which have been adjudged to stand in conflict with our obligations to the other States. I allude to laws relating to "persons held to service or labor," in other States who may escape into this. The federal constitution has provided that they shall not, "in consequence of any law or regulation" of the State to which they may escape, "be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up upon claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." In 1793, Congress passed a law prescribing the manner in which the surrender should be made, and forbidding all persons, under a heavy penalty, from interfering with the claimant. Our laws have thrown obstacles in the way of the claimant in the assertion of his right. The principle upon which these laws are based has been pronounced unconstitutional by our own Supreme Court, and by the Supreme Court of the United States. That high tribunal made a decision at its last January term, which goes the whole length of declaring our laws repugnant to the Constitution, and consequently void. After the question has been thus settled, in the mode prescribed by the Constitution, I submit whether these laws ought any longer to have a place upon the statute book. It does not become us, as a member of the confederacy, to hold a language to our sister States which they may deem offensive, and which the common arbiter between us has declared to be repugnant to the national compact.

I will not discuss the question of slavery. The abstract right to hold any man in bondage, is a question upon which, in this State, there is no diversity of opinion. We have happily relieved ourselves from the evil of slavery. But we have no right to interfere with that institution as it exists in other States. We have virtually agreed that it shall not be done, and until we are prepared to break up the national compact, and take the hazard of a civil war, our obligations to the other States should be faithfully discharged.

The federal Constitution has also provided that "a person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime." At the last session of the legislature, a concurrent resolution was adopted by the two houses, declaring "that, in the opinion of this legislature, stealing a slave within the jurisdiction, and against the laws of Virginia, is a crime within the meaning of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States." I deem it proper to say, that this resolution fully accords with my own judgment. Although such an act may not be forbidden by our laws, the stealing of a slave has been declared to be a crime in other States; and if a transgressor of their criminal laws flee within our jurisdiction, we are bound by compact not to screen him. The Constitution declares that he shall "be delivered up."

In stating thus frankly the opinions which I entertain upon this delicate and important subject, I am aware that I may incur the censure of some whose good opinion I should be glad to preserve. But I repose with confidence upon the great body of the people, who, I am persuaded, are not so blinded by passion or prejudice that they cannot look upon the subject with candor, and who, whatever may be their private opinions, will not attribute my course to any other motive than a sincere desire to preserve the Union, and to perpetuate the blessings of a free government by a scrupulous discharge of the obligations of good faith toward our sister States.

A PROUD DECLARATION.

The Hon. Mr. Preston, senator from South Carolina, in denying the charge that he said in his place, "that if an abolitionist were found in South Carolina, he would inevitably be hung, in spite of the protection of this or any other government," says: "the unjustifiable and ferocious sentiment attributed to me would have been particularly inexcusable in a representative from South Carolina, *whose history I believe is not sullied by a single act of popular violence.*"—*Boston Mail.*

A correspondent desires us to say, in reference to the "proud boast" of Mr. Preston, that South Carolina had never been the theatre of popular violence, that years since, the post-office at Charleston was rifled by a "large and respectable" mob of a lot of abolition newspapers and documents, directed to other cities, which were taken to the street and *burnt*. This accords with our own recollection.

New-York Tribune.

Also, about the same time, a lynch committee was organized in Charleston, with an ex-governor of the State, for chairman, which met openly, and published its proceedings in the papers of the city.

Also, about the same time, Bishop England came very near being lynched, on suspicion of abolition taint.

Also, a little before, a man who had for some cause fallen under public displeasure, was seized by the mob, pumped upon, tarred, feathered and ridden on a rail, in broad day, in the streets of Charleston.

Also, a few years since, Mr. Kendall, a respectable pastor, a Seceder in South Carolina, was set upon by certain chivalrous slaveholders, (because he had read in his church, in obedience to the general assembly, an anti-slavery document from that body,) dragged out of his pulpit, tarred and feathered.

Mr. Preston could not have been ignorant of these scenes of violence, when he uttered his proud boast.

Philanthropist.

Washington Correspondence of the Abolitionist.

SLAVERY IN THE CAPITAL—LUCINDA, A TRUE TALE.

Dear Friend,—Turn once more to a dark picture, alas, the most common picture of slavery, even where its colors are brightest. Some months since a lady, a native of this city, of which she has long been a bright ornament, called to interest me in the case of a colored woman whom she had long known, and whose freedom she very much desired to have secured. A moderate sum only was needed for the purpose, and the arrangements to procure it were soon made. The pressing occasion for making it was this. A man of some note in this city had bought her, four years ago, for about $300. Of this sum, she had paid him, from her hard earnings, more than $250, though without any definite agreement or expectation of securing her freedom for it. He had been building houses on speculation; and, finding some difficulty in paying a mechanic, had agreed to pay him $300 by *this slave.* In his hands she would at once be passed over to the soul traders, and sent to the far South, which is a doom more dreaded by the slaves than death or Liberia! For her freedom he demanded all he originally gave for her; part in cash, the rest as she could earn or procure it. And what were her *peculiar* claims upon the aid and sympathies of the humane? I had almost said she had none! She was a woman, rather intelligent, a good servant, or nurse, kind-hearted, and about to suffer! If relief could be had, a *woman* could not be turned away; especially when her little history was told.

Lucinda had been a mother, but not a wife. The destroyer was one of the proud and rich of the land, honored widely for his *virtues* and *goodness of heart.* Why not? The young and trusting girl, a light mulatto, handsome, and rather vain of her beauty, was won, whether by fraud, persuasion, or force, or all, no matter. Why ask the secrets of the prison-house? Is it not enough that she was *a slave?* Was she not "IN THE POWER" of the tyrant, by the laws of Congress, by *your* laws, reader?

Two children were the fruit of this unhallowed union. The oldest was a fair-haired, blue-eyed girl, with a rosy cheek, and ripe red lips, and a form full of grace and beauty. She was one of nature's loveliest models: and the happy mother was proud indeed of her beautiful daughter. Hardly less proud was she of her son, two years younger. He, too, was fair, but darker than his sister. The heart of the poor mother felt secure. They were *free master's* children, though children of shame; and surely he, in whose bosom she had lain, would never suffer *their* children to be torn from her. So he had often promised. Yes, she and her children, *his* children, should be free at his death! She did not exactly *wish* for his death, but the hour that would secure them their freedom was longed for. And when she saw the unfolding beauty of her daughter, the mother's heart would sometimes throb with uncontrollable emotion. She knew, and who does not?—she well knew *the destiny of a beautiful slave girl,* in our land of Christian and republican faith and morals! Often did she sue for the fulfillment of those promises; and the proud man as often promised.

When the daughter was about fifteen, Lucinda was sold to her present owner, for a *grocery* bill! Her boy had been previously sold to a trader to go, she knew not where! And while she was absent from the city with a family, as a nurse, her daughter was sold, to meet some necessity of the family, in utter disregard of the promises made to her. And the father, too, died before her return, leaving heirs who were very far from sympathizing with her in her anguish. Still they dare not face the mother *directly.* They made her believe that they could not *help* selling her children, to settle the estate. They went through the farce of getting a *very kind-hearted* man, a member of Congress, from the far southwest, to buy her to *wait on his wife!* But the price paid, $1400 cash, told plainly enough the destiny of the poor girl, even if her beauty, and the character of the purchaser had not made it plain, too much so to deceive the anguished mother.

The purchaser resides in New Orleans or near it. Not a word has the mother heard of the fate of that child, so cruelly torn from her, and elevated, *under the laws of Congress,* to a life of infamy, for money paid, *by a member,* doubtless out of his pay for public services.

Years have rolled away, and the poor mother still hopes again to see her children; at least, her daughter; and that hope keeps the spirit up. She longs to be free, that she *may be free to seek that daughter,* if she is yet alive; though I have great doubts if it would be possible to find her again.

Lucinda's case, in some of its details, is not a common one, though in principle, it is one of the most frequent. There are *very few female slaves* whose first child is not the offspring of a white father. What shall shield the helpless against fraud, lust, and force, when the *law,* (*your* law, reader; the law of Congress, in *your* NATION'S CAPITAL,) gives to all of them the sanctions of rectitude. P. P.

Communications.

MINUTES

Of the Philadelphia City and County Anti-Slavery Convention, held in the Reformed Presbyterian meeting-house, in Cherry street, below 11th, on the 21st, 22d, and 23d of the 12th month, (December,) 1842.

The convention was called to order by J. Miller McKim. Edward Needles was elected president; who, on taking the chair, addressed the meeting on its duties and responsibilities, and urged the importance of a serious and solemn consideration of the business to come before the convention.

Robert Purvis and Samuel D. Hastings were appointed vice-presidents.

Sarah Pugh and Benjamin S. Jones, secretaries.

The call for the convention having been read, it was

Resolved, That all persons present favorable to immediate emancipation, be considered members of this convention; and that persons not abolitionists be invited to participate in the discussions.

On motion that a business committee be appointed, a long discussion arose, in which many members participated. The question being put, was decided in the affirmative; and Thomas Earle, S. D. Hastings, M. B. Linton, J. Mott, and J. Miller McKim, were appointed that committee.

Resolved, By the abolitionists of the city and county of Philadelphia, here assembled, that it is expedient to form a county anti-slavery society.

J. Miller McKim, E. M. Davis, and T. S. Cavender, were appointed a committee to draft a constitution, and to nominate officers for the society; to present them to a future sitting of this meeting, for its consideration.

Resolved, That the future sittings of this convention commence at 9 o'clock, A. M. adjourn at 1, P. M. and meet again at 2 1-2, P. M.

Adjourned.

22*d. Morning session.*—Meeting called to order by the president.

The minutes of yesterday were read, and, with some alterations, adopted.

The committee to draft a constitution for a county society, and to nominate officers for the same, reported. After an animated and interesting discussion, the constitution, with some changes in one of its articles, was adopted. The meeting not agreeing with the nominations, this subject was referred again to the committee.

Then adjourned.

Afternoon.—Convention met. Business committee reported.

The following resolutions were read, discussed, and adopted:

Whereas, the foundation principle of the anti-slavery cause is the love and good will towards our fellow-creatures, which is inculcated by the gospel; therefore,

Resolved, That under the influence of this blessed feeling, we are especially bound to labor with all our might for the relief of those in the bonds of slavery, and to plead the cause of those who are not permitted to declare for themselves the cruel wrongs which are daily inflicted upon them.

Whereas, it should be the aim of all moral reformers, to first strive for self-purification; so that the consistency of their conduct, and the sacrifices it involves, may be a pledge of their sincerity of purpose; and whereas, it is the purchasers and consumers of slave produce that sustain the system of slavery, and strengthen the hands of the oppressor; therefore,

Resolved, That they who buy and consume the products of the slave's toil, are justly chargeable with all the wrongs and cruelties connected with the system of slavery, from the internal wars of Africa, to the death-scourging of the slave in America; and that so long as abolitionists are so careless of their moral obligations as to continue in the practise of using such goods, the testimony they bear against slavery is incomplete, and the lessons of justice and of mercy which they teach, are rendered, in a great measure, inefficient, by their own inconsistency.

Resolved, That the abolitionist who pleads, in justification of the use of slave produce, the inconvenience and additional expense, a contrary course would involve, only uses the same arguments by which the slaveholder, with equal or greater show of justice, attempts to excuse his connection with slavery.

On motion,

Resolved, That a committee be appointed, to prepare a memorial to the State legislature, asking them to pass a law, forbidding any public officer of this commonwealth, under color of his office, aiding or abetting, in any manner, the arrest of individuals claimed as fugitive slaves; also, to forbid the use of our jails, or other public property in detaining such persons.

Committee—S. D. Hastings and Robert Purvis.

Resolutions were presented by the business committee on the subject of a document issued by the Yearly meeting of a society of Friends, lately held in Lombard street, Baltimore. Their consideration made the order of the day for ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

S. D. Hastings, from the committee on memorials, reported the following form, which was adopted, and referred to the executive committee of the State society, to be printed for circulation.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The undersigned, citizens of Pennsylvania, would respectfully ask you to pass a law forbidding any public officer of this commonwealth, under color of his office, aiding or abetting in any manner the arrest of individuals claimed as fugitive slaves; also, to forbid the use of our jails, or other public property, in detaining such persons, or in delivering them to their claimants.

Daniel Neall and S. D. Hastings were appointed to put it in a suitable form, sign it on behalf of this convention, and forward it to the State legislature.

E. M. Davis and Joshua L. Hallowell were appointed to the charge of having the constitution of the county society engrossed, and prepared for signature.

On motion,

Resolved, That in the future discussions of this convention, each speaker be limited to ten minutes, (unless by the unanimous consent of the meeting,) until all who wish have spoken.

The committee reported the following names as officers for the county society:

Henry Grew, President.
Robert Purvis and Thomas Earle, Vice-Presidents.
Joshua L. Hallowell, Secretary.
S. D. Hastings, Treasurer.
John D. Griscom, Mary Grew, Mary P. Egan, Daniel A. Payne, and Eli Dillin, Board of Managers.

Who were all duly elected. Adjourned.

23*d. Morning session.*—Convention met. The minutes read and adopted.

The resolutions in regard to the address emanating from the Baltimore Yearly meeting, were laid on the table. On motion,

Resolved, That the provision of the constitution of Pennsylvania, in excluding the people of color from the right of suffrage, while they are subjected to laws which they have no voice in making, and are heavily taxed by the national and State governments, is unjust in principle, oppressive in practise, and contrary to the doctrines which led to the separation of this country from the government of Britain.

Resolved, That in the fact that the people of color are believed to contribute more, in taxes, for the support of the poor than they receive, we see evidence of the enormity of the injustice of this restriction, and in the disadvantages under which they labor in proceedings before magistrates; in the conduct of the city police at the commencement of the late riots, in arresting chiefly those who were acting on the defensive; in the conduct of our juries and judges in acquitting most of the white rioters, and in punishing, among the convicted, most severely the colored people, who were the least guilty; as well as in many other facts, we see the evidences of its practical injury and oppressiveness.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed, to prepare a memorial on the part of this meeting, asking the legislature to take measures for altering the constitution so as to make no distinction in respect to color.

Committee—Robert Purvis and S. D. Hastings.

The resolutions relating to the Baltimore epistle were then called up, and pending their discussion, the meeting adjourned.

Afternoon.—Convention met. The consideration of the resolutions on the Baltimore epistle were resumed, and after a long and interesting discussion, adopted, as follows:

Resolved, That in the recent address by a Yearly meeting of the Society of Friends, held in Lombard street, Baltimore, issued apparently for the purpose of discouraging all active and efficient exertions making in our country for the emancipation of the oppressed, we witness a lamentable proof of the degeneracy of portions of that society from its former noble stand and strenuous efforts in the cause of freedom, and a striking practical violation of their own discipline, which requires that they shall maintain a faithful testimony against slavery.

Resolved, That we understand the said document to assert or insinuate, that the abolitionists wish to increase *coercion,* instead of diminishing it—that the anti-slavery societies have caused the oppressive laws in relation to slaves and the people of color, most of which were passed before those societies came into existence—that abolitionists wish to deny the enjoyment of freedom of opinion and conscience, instead of securing it equally to all, without distinction of color or condition—that the Society of Friends in former times did not favor the same legal coercion to protect human beings against those who would hold them as slaves, which they availed themselves of for their own personal security, and the recovery of their just dues, but were willing that slaves should be compelled to serve just so long as the master should claim it as his privilege, and consistent with his conscience—and that those who rebuke wrong in the spirit of Christianity, never awake angry passions, nor subject themselves to mob violence, imprisonment, or death, from the hands of the wicked; all of which assertions and insinuations we believe to be alike opposed to fact and to historical records.

Resolved, That in our opinion, those who prepared and issued the said address, or many of them, in condemning coercion upon the wrongdoer, and at the same time upholding, by their votes and their conduct, coercion upon the victims of oppression—in advocating freedom of conscience for the master, and denying it to the slave—in requiring the reading of the sacred scriptures in the families of their members, and in quietly resting under laws made by their own chosen representatives, for preventing the reading of the same scriptures by slave families—in joining themselves actively in the most popular political and other excitements of the day, while they object to joining the anti-slavery reform, under the unfounded pretense that it is a *popular* excitement, and on the ground that the Lord's people should dwell alone—in acknowledging that slavery is a great *political* evil, and yet condemning the use of political means for its removal—in entering the political field as zealous partisans, with a view to secure a slight benefit to themselves by measures confessedly desired in the will and wisdom of man, while they object to political measures for the relief of the slave, on the pretext that they are desired in that same will and wisdom—in advocating the enforcement of a coercive tariff upon him who believes in the right of free trade, and objecting to legal coercion to compel the slaveholder to cease from what they admit to be the greatest "cruelty, outrage, and oppression, which the annals of human barbarity furnishes," on the pretense that it would "invade [the slaveholder's] sacred right to act according to the dictates of divine light"—in professing to maintain a faithful testimony against slavery, and yet seeking for apologies for it, and warring more upon abolition than upon slavery—in assisting to compel the thief to do justice, and objecting to the like compulsion towards him whose wrong is tenfold more grievous to the sufferer than that inflicted by the thief—in laboring politically to remove comparatively slight wrongs inflicted on the Indians, and in co-operating politically in inflicting tenfold greater evils upon the descendants of Africa—in voting for the authors of oppressive laws without pretending to any divine call, and yet refusing to petition for cessation from oppression, on the pretext that they are waiting for a divine call, and an extraordinary interposition of Providence—in stepping forth as the zealous opponents of any interference with freedom of action and of conscience for the slaveholder, while they raise no voice against the law made by their own agents, which severely punish any colored man for possessing a document advocating the principles of liberty—and in professing that they wish to allow to all others the rights and privileges which they claim for themselves, and yet making no apparent efforts to remove the laws passed by their agents creating the enormous distinctions between the privileges and punishments awarded to themselves on the one hand, and to the people of color on the other; in all these things, if we rightly understand them, we witness a most glaring inconsistency, and we fear a most extensive bias of self-interest or timidity in the promulgation of this document.

Resolved, That we attribute the severe laws against emancipation and the colored people, referred to in the said address, in part, to the neglect of the said Yearly meeting, and other bodies and individuals professing Christian principles, to maintain and urge those principles with the same faithfulness which distinguished the last century; and we attribute in part the mob violence exercised toward the friends of freedom, to documents like the one of which we speak, and to conduct like that practised by its promulgators.

Voted, That we hereby request all papers friendly to universal freedom to give publicity to the foregoing resolutions; and that we especially desire that all papers which published the address of the Baltimore Yearly meeting, will, as an act of justice toward those against whom it was directed, give them an insertion.

The committee on memorials presented the following report. The first part was directed to be signed by the officers of this convention, and the latter part was referred to the executive committee of the State society, with a request that they should print and circulate it for signatures.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The undersigned, on behalf of a "convention of the friends of human rights, of the city and county of Philadelphia, and parts adjacent, would respectfully request you to take measures for altering the constitution of this State, so that no distinction shall be made in the rights of citizens on account of complexion.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The undersigned, citizens of Pennsylvania, would respectfully request you to take measures for altering the constitution of this State, so that no distinction shall be made in the rights of citizens on account of complexion.

The following preamble and resolutions were then taken up, discussed, and adopted:

Whereas, the divine law enjoins it upon us, "not to deliver unto his master the servant which has escaped from his master unto us, but that he shall dwell with us, even among us, in that place which he shall choose, in one of our gates where it liketh him best;" and whereas, Blackstone, in his commentaries, has laid down the principle, that no human enactment can be binding which conflicts with the law of God; therefore,

Resolved, That that clause of the United States Constitution, which requires the surrender of a fugitive slave to his master, is not morally binding upon the American people, and should be disregarded by all who fear God and love righteousness.

Resolved, therefore, That the clause of the Constitution requiring the surrender of fugitive slaves, ought to be repealed, absolutely, totally, and immediately; and that we pledge ourselves to labor for its repeal.

Resolved, That the injunction of the Son of God, to "do unto others as we would they should do unto us," requires that we should feed, clothe, and protect the flying fugitive, while making his escape from southern oppression.

Whereas, by the late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, relative to the recovery of fugitive slaves, any citizen of the North, white as well as colored, is liable to be subject and carried into slavery.

Resolved, therefore, That this convention recommend the formation of vigilant committees in different sections of the State, for the purpose of protecting the rights of those who may be claimed as fugitive slaves.

Voted, That the acknowldgements of this convention are hereby tendered to the pastor and trustees of the Reformed Presbyterian church, for their kindness in granting us the free use of their building.

EDWARD NEEDLES, *President.*

SARAH PUGH, BENJAMIN S. JONES, } *Secretaries.*

LETTER FROM ILLINOIS.

Dear Friend and Brother,—A native of this State apprehended a slave on his way to Canada, and took him back to Missouri. There, he was accosted by a Methodist preacher, who seemed much displeased that the slave had not been whipped when he was taken. The slave catcher was surprised to hear a "minister of the gospel" speak with such anxious delight about the use of the lash. It led him into closer thought; and it was not many weeks before he began to declare that he would never more try to make money by hunting slaves, or upholding slavery. Thus, slave hunting has led one to think more mercifully, and to lift up his voice against the wicked system.

During the last six months, many here have begun to believe that we should do well to wash our own hands of slavery, and kindly to urge upon the slaveholders the means of getting rid of this dangerous evil. On this subject, there is a very decided change, in some parts of the West. Very many, who have been on the fence, are now jumping off. They begin to perceive that our merciful Redeemer would be more pleased with tenderness and compassion, than with the lashes of overseers.

Yesterday, I was in a neighborhood where I heard of six church members, who, until recently, have been very angry with any who spoke against slavery; they now begin to confess that the Redeemer came for the poor and the oppressed—to those who sit in darkness; and that the slaves ought to hear his gospel preached, and learn to read about Calvary, and the great atonement.

Casting those three young men [Thompson, Work, and Burr,] into the penitentiary of Missouri, has had an effect unexpected to the slaveholders. Many have thus heard of Canada, who never before knew that such a place existed; and they commenced running thither. When it will cease, unless a gradual emancipation law be enacted, I know not. More have left Missouri for Canada, during the last summer, than ever did before, in the course of many years. The road is becoming broader. Scarcely any are now arrested. Somehow or other, they contrive to escape even from the most active and vigilant. People are so angry about this, that it is in vain to go there to preach now; but we can preach the sin of slavery *here,* and people listen more patiently than they used to do. Let the word of truth be uttered, and the work of forgiveness and love go on; after a time, we shall behold the fruits.

I cannot have this letter published with my name, at present; for the citizens of Missouri are so blinded by excitement, that they are ready to believe any amount of falsehood against those who expose the cruel system of slavery.

******

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE BUCKS COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Resolved, That the late decision of the Yearly meeting of the Society of Friends in New-York, in the case of Isaac T. Hopper; and the advice in reference to slavery, issued by the late Yearly meeting at Baltimore, evince a marked deviation from the original landmarks established by the founders of that ancient and highly-respectable society; and manifest a lamentable willingness, in a portion of the society, to unite with the pro-slavery spirit of the times, instead of standing by, and guarding the rights and interests of the slave, as heretofore.

Resolved, That in the recent resolution, unanimously passed by the legislature of Vermont, in favor of such alteration in the Constitution of the United States as shall abolish slavery from our land, we witness a gratifying evidence of the salutary effects of the efforts of anti-slavery societies, and the spread of their principles among all political parties.

Resolved, That a committee of two, to consist of one man, and one woman, from each local society, be appointed to circulate petitions to Congress, and to our State legislature, for abolishing all laws which, in any way, uphold or sanction slavery.

The following persons were appointed: Wm. H. Johnson, Elizabeth Shaw, Buckingham; Dr. Watson Trego, Hannah Trego, Amasa Worthington, Hannah Atkinson, Pineville; Mahlon B. Linton, Sarah Beans, Lower Makefield; Dr. J. S. Longshore, Maria Huddleson, Middletown.

The circumstances relative to the late abduction of a colored man from our county, to the State of Maryland, having been made known to the meeting, the following resolution was passed, in reference to the transaction:

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the legality of this proceeding, and what steps ought to be taken in reference to it. The committee are Wm. H. Johnson, Dr. Watson Trego, and Charles Smith, jr.

Attest: M. B. LINTON, *President.*
WM. BURGESS, *Sec'y.*

LETTER FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

James Monroe, who is too busy to chronicle his own movements, not long since addressed us on the peculiarities of chattel slavery. The lecture was able and eloquent. For two hours, a large audience gave to it their undivided attention. Incidentally, the orator spoke of Texas. His remarks, of course, could not be very flattering to that republic. A young man who holds a commission in the Texan navy, happened to be present; and "he felt called upon" to give notice that he would reply on the following Sunday evening; when he promised to point out many false statements, and prove that Mr. Monroe had highly colored his facts. An effort was made to call him out on the spot; but he declined; saying, "Time was necessary to prepare himself." Fortunately, it was convenient for friend Monroe to be present when he made his defense. In the meantime, an arrangement was made that each should speak half the time. The Texan spoke first, and for one hour. He contended that the scriptures sanction chattel slavery; and read from the 21st chapter of Leviticus. He said the accounts of cruelty at the South could not be true, because it is against the *interest* of the master to allow such barbarity. He contended that the masters had a *right* to their slaves; and, therefore, if we desire their freedom, we ought to contribute half the sum necessary for that purpose; *then* we could ask their masters to be equally generous! If set free, the slaves would come to the North, and compete *with northern mechanics;* but still, they are *too indolent and shiftless* to be fit for freedom! The system of slavery is a bad one; but England fastened it upon us; it is an evil exercescence on the body politic; but it is protected by our Constitution. (a Bible institution, too!!!) The result of emancipation in the West Indies had been ruinous. To prove this, a statement in the Boston Atlas, dated Nov. 26, of trouble in Jamaica, was read. He predicted that abolitionists would dissolve our "glorious Union;" complained that England was sending her emissaries here, to lecture to us on slavery, and thus the more easily "destroy the only hope of freedom in the world." He prophesied that, in thirty years, these shiftless negroes, so totally unfit to take care of themselves, would be the masters at the South, and *thus* slavery will be destroyed! So, after all, then the "only hope of the world" will be destroyed by our own people, if that hope rests on not abolishing slavery. He said Texas had been grossly slandered. It was not the "hell" it had been represented to be; and her constitution is a fac-simile of our own! All these were assertions, without any documents in proof.

The preceding remarks will show the kind of reasoning, and the authority upon which statements are made, to support charges against the anti-slavery cause. It is not necessary to state to the readers of the Standard that these positions were refuted by indisputable evidence, besides refuting themselves. Fact after fact was presented, and conclusions based thereon were brought out in a masterly manner.

The Texan again spoke for half an hour. This time, he did not pretend to deny there was cruelty at the South; but he maintained it had been rendered necessary, by the movements of the abolitionists! In answer to this, the testimony of Whitefield, of the elder Edwards, of Wesley, and others, was produced, the dates of which proved them to have been written before modern abolitionists were born.

By the time our friend closed the debate, his whole soul was interested; and he spoke with a force and eloquence which those who heard him will not soon forget. We have every reason to think the moral influence of the debate has been very good. It has awakened, in many minds, an interest in anti-slavery truth, where none before existed.

All that is wanted to enlist a hearty support of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and its object, is to make its aims and principles fully *understood.* In no way, it seems to me, can that knowledge be spread so rapidly and successfully, as by the living preacher, whose heart is in the cause he advocates, and who speaks because he has a word craving for utterance. He will then have an earnestness and power, which *will* arouse men. When such an one is opposed in public, it is of incalculable advantage to the cause. Minds which otherwise would never come within the sound of his voice, are there. These he cannot drive *from* the truth, even if he does not win them to embrace it. But many of this class may thus be brought to see and acknowledge their error; the wavering are confirmed; the faint-hearted are strengthened; the decided have their zeal renewed; and, when the discussions are conducted in good temper, the erroneous side is inevitably the only loser. F.

Clappville.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JAN. 12, 1843.

LUKEWARMNESS AND SEVERITY.

I have received the following communication, in reply to a late editorial, entitled LUKEWARMNESS:

"I was delighted with the tone and spirit of the resolutions passed by the Unitarian church in Duxbury, Massachusetts, and could not but feel that they might do much good. They partook of the spirit of the 'Letters from New-York,' on the subject of prisons, capital punishment, &c. How delightful in those letters, to find palliatives for those unfortunate persons, whose moral sense had become blinded by the want of early education, or by the false influences of society. To '*extenuate crime*' is quite a different thing from showing that the persons accused are *not guilty of crime.* Those poor, debased children in your city, of whom you have spoken with so much tenderness, can hardly commit crime. Hardly any light enters the soul, through that window which looks toward heaven. They may do much that is wrong to the outward eye, and yet be guiltless before Him, whose eye seeth the heart. Let us apply the standard of judging, which you have applied to criminals in our penitentiaries, to the slaveholders, and see if charity does not demand a discriminating judgment. The resolutions say that they are ready to admit 'any consideration which Christian charity requires, in excuse of the advocacy and support of slavery.' It is asked, in reply, 'Would they say the same of murder? adultery? of daily continued theft?' Now, it must first be shown, that *all* slaveholders are murderers, before they can be accused of murder, without qualification; that *all* slaveholders are adulterers, must be *proved,* before it can be asserted that they are adulterers, without qualification; and as for theft, it must be shown that *every* slaveholder understands it to be *theft* to hold a slave. This, I presume, cannot be done. Some of them have grown up under such vicious training, that they do not so understand it; and hence they are not guilty, in the sight of Heaven, or of Christian charity, of theft. You might as well accuse that pining consumptive of suicide, when not her own fault, but the mistaken and wicked course of her parent, lodged in her system the seeds of the fatal disease.

I admire charity; and I do not wish it to be confined north of Mason and Dixon's line. Let not our abhorrence of an evil charge with a murderous, adulterous, thievish spirit, all who may be in any way connected with it. As well accuse ourselves, and all our ancestors, of a drunkard's spirit, and a drunkard's doom, because we and they were more or less directly engaged in *making* drunkards.

Better err on the side of mercy, than on the side of vindictiveness. There is as severe a punishment inflicted upon the unjust judge, as upon the evil doer. Dr. Channing said much more palliative things of the slaveholder, than do these resolutions; and had he been called upon to draft resolutions upon that subject, I can conceive of nothing which would have been more likely to have fallen from his pen, than a caution against unkind and wholesale denunciation. His writings are full of such cautions; and if I mistake not, he says the same in substance in his Lenox address, (though I have it not before me,) as is contained in those resolutions.

It is a question whether we may not have forgotten to be kind-hearted, and charitable, in our endeavors to relieve the oppressed and abused. Better, far better, be the bondman of a cruel master, on a sugar plantation, and be pure in heart—God's freeman, though his feeblest child—than a champion of liberty, and a slave to vindictive, or unkind feelings. Nothing is gained for the good of the world, by injustice to one class of persons, for the benefit of another. Nothing but pure truth, and pure love, is capable of working a true reform. Let us remember this. Some slaveholders, who have been educated in the midst of that unjust system, but whose eyes have been blinded to its evils, or who have not known how to remove them, may shine brighter than we, in the kingdom of God. Some poor, denounced convict in our prisons, some slaveholder, who has had our maledictions heaped upon him, may enter the kingdom, and we be thrown out. R. P. S."

The writer of the above letter appears to have misunderstood the position I intended to assume, in my remarks on the Duxbury Resolutions. Perhaps my language was less clear than the idea in my own mind. I do not wish to be *more* severe with slaveholders than with other criminals; and I readily admit that when any crime is sanctioned by law and custom, there should be more allowance made for *individual cases.* Of course, there is no difference whatever in the nature of the crime itself; but every man is governed partly by public opinion; and with a large class it constitutes the *only* restraint. The first French Revolution may give us an idea of the hidden and hideous things that would stalk abroad in the light, if the pressure of public opinion were taken off. On the best of us, this restraint rests, like the atmosphere, so many pounds to every inch, though we may be unconscious of its weight. Such being the state of things, additional allowance should unquestionably be made for those individuals who have committed faults sanctioned by a corrupt public opinion. For a Bostonian to fit out a vessel for the African slave trade now, would argue a more hardened state in the individual, than it would half a century ago; for he must now sin against greater light, and stronger convictions.

But the very facts that should make us more careful about condemning *individuals* without reservation, should make us more earnestly indignant against *the system which nurtures the crime, and the false public opinion which sanctions it.* We should be more careful to reprove a popular sin, than one which society universally condemns; simply because there is more *need* of our influence in one case than in the other. Thus, in speaking of duelling, or of capital punishment, I would be careful to avoid any expressions more lenient, than I would apply to other forms of murder; not that I consider the duellist and the hangman *worse* than the assassin; but because public opinion is less sound with regard to their crimes; and there is, therefore, more need, that I should avoid even seeming to palliate them.

John C. Colt killed a man in a rage, probably under circumstances of great provocation, and, as far as human beings can judge, entirely without premeditation. Many petitions were sent in for a commutation of his sentence; but Governor Seward declared that petitions had no weight with him—that he was guided by proofs of the crime in question, and by the decisions of courts of justice.

Certain prize-fighters were taken up for killing McCoy in pugilistic combat. They urged, in extenuation, that fights of the same character had taken place repeatedly, without the interference of magistrates, or the punishment of law. In all probability, many of the individuals in question, if not all of them, were not aware that they incurred any more legal danger by amusing themselves with prize-fighting, than they did by going to the theatre. But these ignorant men were sentenced to the penitentiary; a sort of boarding-school for crime, which society provides for her foundling children, preparatory to the higher collegiate degrees of Sing-Sing.

Colonel Webb, an educated man, with full knowledge of the laws, nurtured amid the humanizing influences of literature and cultivated society, heaped provocations upon Thomas F. Marshall, a man whose standard was well known to be what is called the "code of honor." Having, by repeated attacks, heated his Kentuckian blood to the challenging point, he accepts the challenge. In other words, he goes out to a prize-fight for revenge, not for money. This was deliberately done, in the face of a known law, with abundant preparation, and the coolest premeditation. Yet Colonel Webb received the warmest sympathy, and unqualified pardon. It was said, in excuse for his offense, that he had always held and professed military principles; so had John C. Colt. The latter merely did, in sudden anger, what the former prepared to do with mature deliberation. It was urged that other citizens of New-York had fought duels without being subjected to legal penalties, and so the law came to be regarded as obsolete. The prize-fighters had precisely the same excuse; and they, too, had always professed fighting principles, as well as the more polished and educated colonel. Another reason assigned for his pardon, was, that petitions in his favor had been so numerously signed; the very reason to which the Chief Magistrate refused to give any weight, in the case of John C. Colt.

I allude to these facts, in this connection, merely to show that Colonel Webb's offense was pardoned by Governor Seward (according to his own showing) on the ground that duelling was not so generally and severely condemned by public opinion, as other forms of murder. Now it seems to me this was the very reason why it should be more carefully stigmatized. As an administrator of the laws, it was Governor Seward's business to *reform* a corrupt public opinion, not be *guided* by it. If he punished one of the above named offenses, he ought to have punished all; if he pardoned one, he ought to have pardoned all. In pardoning the duellist, *because* he was sustained by popular opinion, he did a vast deal toward strengthening and perpetuating that opinion. It was a stab to public morality, which the many wise and good acts of his administration fail to balance, in my mind.

Because I say this, do I necessarily imply more vindictiveness toward Col. Webb than toward other offenders against the moral code? Certainly not. I have no doubt that he has, like other mortals, many good qualities and kind feelings, and that his errors are to be largely attributed to diseased social influences. But the very fact that his offense is not *generally* reproved, makes me more anxious to reprove it. And just so it is with slaveholding. Doubtless, kind-hearted and benevolent men hold slaves; but that in no degree affects my duty with regard to making the sin of slavery felt by all men. However good they may be, slaveholding forms no part of their goodness. The less we trouble ourselves about passing judgment upon *individuals,* whether for adulation or censure, the better. God alone can weigh and balance motives; but He has given us the power to judge of principles.

I have no objection that a church should urge, in extenuation of duelling, "all the considerations that Christian charity require;" such as the nature of education, the state of public opinion, the amount of provocation, &c. But my sense of justice would insist upon including in the same category of extenuation, all other men, who kill each other to revenge insults or injuries; and if these were *not* included in the same list, I should fear that the church thought more lightly of the sin of duelling, than of other forms of murder.

The writer of the letter says that in order to maintain this position with regard to slaveholders, I must "first prove that *all* slaveholders are thieves," &c. This is as easy to prove, as that *all* duellists are murderers; for the duellist, too, has been educated in such a way as to blind his moral vision; and he, too, may not understand duelling *to be* murder. In order to help him understand it, I should be particularly careful never to separate his offense from others of the same class; though I would at the same time award all just praise to his good qualities.

But in order to maintain the position I assumed, in my remarks on the Duxbury Resolutions, it seems to me that it is *not* necessary to prove that *every* slaveholder is a murderer. The resolutions say, "We are ready to admit any considerations, which Christian charity require, in excuse of the advocacy and support of *slavery.*" The character of individual slaveholders is altogether a different affair, and one that I have ever been most willing to leave to the Allwise Mind, who alone can judge how far each individual *knows* what he does. But *slavery* itself I know to be unmixed evil—the concrete of all vices and all crimes; and because the law sanctions it, and public opinion faintly rebukes it, I will, *therefore,* be particularly careful not to be *more* charitable toward it, than toward *other* crimes, which

CORRESPONDENCE FROM WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 31, 1843.

To-day, the President communicated to the House of Representatives a voluminous report from the Secretary of State, touching the claims of American citizens on the government of Haiti. It was ordered to be printed. This communication, and the discussions which may arise upon it, will serve, perhaps, to remind the people of free and commercial States,—indeed, of the farming and manufacturing, as well as commercial—of the duty of plying Congress with petitions for the recognition of Haiti, and the formation of a commercial treaty with her. There is no island of the West Indies, except Cuba, and no equal extent of country in the world, except Great Britain, with which we could carry on a commerce as advantageous as we might with Haiti; provided we would qualify ourselves, by the acknowledgment of her independence, to profit by the advantages she holds out. The vessels and cargoes of nations refusing that acknowledgment are subjected to higher duties. Even with this burden, which the President and Senate might remove in six weeks, and which has now been submitted to, during forty years, out of complaisance to the unreasonable and inhuman prejudices of the South,—*our commerce with that island is ten times as great as with Texas.*

Mr. Benton's call for information respecting the stipulations for the suppression of the slave trade in the late British treaty, has been passed by the Senate.

The bill to refund General Jackson's fine, has been referred to the judiciary committee of the Senate. This is fatal to it; for although the committee will, it is presumed, report in favor of the passage of the bill, it will be with a proviso, excluding any inference against the honor of the judge, and the supremacy of the civil over the military authority. A letter of the General's to the editor of the Globe, has lately been published, in which he says, in reference to the bill proposed at the last session: "You judged rightly of my feelings, when you say I would not touch one cent of the money, under that odious and insulting amended bill; and those who proposed the amendment, if they possessed any honorable feeling, knew that I would not. I would starve, before I would be fed on their especial grace, at the expense of my honor and my fame. * * * My gratitude is due to the republican States for their efforts to have this unjust imputation upon my fame *wiped from the records*, by a law refunding the fine and costs, so *unjustly and tyrannically imposed by a vindictive judge*, sitting in his own cause." The General has not grown either gentler or more modest as he has grown older. The business of slave trading has a bad influence upon a man's manners, as well as upon his morals.

There is now in Washington an envoy from the Sandwich islands. His object is to obtain from this government a recognition of the independence of those islands. On Saturday, the President transmitted to Congress a message, recommending that step. Mr. Cushing, in the House, explained it, as having an important bearing upon the proposed occupation of the Oregon country, (for which a bill has been discussed in the Senate this week,) and upon the commerce which might be expected to spring up betwixt the United States and the ports of China, opened by the late British treaty with that empire.

The bill to repeal the bankrupt law has been, or rather it has *not* been, the subject of the principal debate which has yet occurred. It is a president-making debate, and has about as much connection with the bankrupt act, as it has with the restoration of the Jews. There has been a good deal of crimination and recrimination, as to the original author of this departure from business and order. Mr. Everett, of Vermont, opened the discussion, by a speech in favor of repeal. He maintained that the law had done its work, in releasing a large class of citizens involved in hopeless embarrassment; and that its further continuance would destroy all confidence and credit in the country.

Mr. Barnard, of New-York, made a close and luminous argument in favor of amending the law, and retaining it. He begged that if it must be destroyed, it might not be on the ground alledged by Mr. Everett. Mr. Winthrop, of Massachusetts, made a brief, but very sensible speech on the same side; also Mr. Underwood, of Kentucky, who was in favor of a proposition, which Mr. Barnard had submitted, to take away the right of voluntary bankruptcy, leaving the system, in other respects, to stand.

Mr. Wise, of Virginia, declared himself against it, as he was when it was adopted. He insinuated that the whigs had passed the law to get the votes of debtors; forgetting that there were creditor votes equally numerous. The reaction, he said, had now commenced.

Mr. Arnold, of Tennessee, replied in the stump style, and spouted a great deal of politics in the course of his hour. He called the President "the traitor at the other end of the avenue." He presented one excellent argument against the repeal, which in fact has been urged by several others, both before and after him. It is this; the bankrupt law destroys the system of preferences, and prevents fraudulent assignments. The most desperate hazards in trade, and the wildest speculations, are undertaken to retrieve desperate, or to make sudden fortunes. Without a bankrupt law, it is constantly happening that a man will get money for such hazards, on promising to give a preference, and probably an extravagant premium to the lender. Very often, on the strength of that loan, he will get a great deal of property in his hands on purpose to conceal it, or transfer it to former creditors, whom he has engaged to prefer. Thus the worst tendency of the business of this country, viz: to unjustifiable risks, extravagant credit, and violent revulsions, is encouraged and aggravated by the law, as it was before the bankrupt act, and as it will be, if that is repealed.

Mr. Cushing followed Mr. Arnold. He justified the administration in seeking support from another party, when it could not obtain it from the whig party. The latter he described as dashed in pieces on the firm rock of executive constitutional power; he intimated that there was a rumor, a whisper, that another party was going to dash itself in madness upon the same rock. He reminded all parties of the immovableness of the government, amidst the shifting elements around it; spoke of the great career, which this country held out, to ambition; of the number of present competitors for the presidency, and the equipoise of power and prospects among them; and said that there were men connected with the administration, who meant, at a proper time, to have a word to say in this matter. Finally, Mr. Cushing declared that it was not for the political interest of any party to wage a very furious war against the administration; and he exhorted all to abstain from these episodes in debate, and confine themselves strictly to the public business; alledging, as a justification of himself, the attack on the administration by Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Thompson, of Indiana, replied to Mr. Cushing. He charged him with stalking into the hall of representatives of the people, and putting up the executive power, patronage, and spoils, at auction; he replied to statements which Mr. Cushing had made, in the recess of Congress, to his constituents in Massachusetts, and particularly one, in which the whigs in Congress were represented as having offered, at the extra session, to let the bank bill go over to the regular session, provided the President would not, in the meantime, disturb the incumbents in his cabinet. This charge Mr. T. repelled, with powerful indignation, demanding names and proofs, and hurling defiance at the accusers.

While Mr. Cushing and Mr. Thompson were speaking, the excitement in the House was at times very high; now loud explosions of laughter, and now cries of disapprobation, such as "veto, veto," "patronage," "spoils."

Mr. Everett, of Vermont, charged Mr. Cushing with the introduction of the inflammatory matter of the debate, and called for the previous question, which was not sustained.

Mr. Wise spoke in vindication of his friend from Massachusetts, [Mr. Cushing,] and charged Mr. Thompson with gross injustice to that gentleman, in representing him as offering the executive power and patronage to the highest bidder. Mr. W. defended Mr. Tyler, denied that he had been guilty of treachery, and affirmed that the seeds of division and death were in the whig party before General Harrison's decease. These seeds were the rival pretensions of Henry Clay and Daniel Webster to the succession; he declared that Harrison had a leaning towards the latter. Many members, in an undertone, denied this, and said that Mr. Clay had the offer of the State department.

Mr. Fessenden, of Maine, made a manly and pertinent speech, first in support of the policy of a permanent bankrupt system, and then in reply to Messrs. Cushing and Wise. He thought that Mr. Thompson had not, in any degree, misrepresented Mr. Cushing's remarks, and that Mr. Wise's attempt to vindicate them was a failure. Mr. Fessenden maintained that it was the duty of a representative to act according to his best judgment, and his honest convictions, even if in so doing he went counter to the popular voice: this had always been his principle, and if the people did not like it, so be it. It was refreshing to me to hear from a man depending on popular election, something which I could call *anti-humbug*. There, thought I, is a man in whom the people may repose confidence. After all, he would regard their real wishes ten times as much as the sycophants and demagogues would, who flatter them to their ruin.

Mr. Wise's explanation of the split in the whig ranks, unfortunately for his credibility, is totally different from that which he gave in a letter to the "Tertium quid," or "Tyler party," of Virginia, written shortly after the extra session. *Then* the repeal of the *gag rule*, and other measures of the whigs supposed to be favorable to abolition, were assigned as the leading causes of that event. Those causes were then fresh in his memory, and probably he stated them truly. It is well known that Mr. Tyler interfered, by a letter addressed to Mr. Johnson, of Maryland, in favor of the restoration of the gag. This, at all events, was his first act in opposition to the will of the party, which elevated him to power. In Congress, it is good policy to keep slavery, as an element in the government, entirely out of sight; but at the South, when slaveholders are to be rallied and formed into a column of attack upon the rights and interests of freemen, then slavery becomes the slogan.

January 3, 1843.

I often think of the keen contrasts and violent moral concussions, within our country, and weary myself with conjecturing what is to come of them. The instrument in virtue of which we *are* a country, declares that every man has an inborn and inalienable right to liberty; and yet we hold millions of our countrymen in chains and slavery! We refused, with insurrection and rivers of blood, to pay *pence* under a comparatively trifling usurpation of authority, and we pay *pounds* to support the cruellest and most sanguinary despotism that exists within the circuit of the sun! We contribute half a million of dollars every year, to send missionaries and Bibles to distant lands, and look unmoved upon millions of heathen in our own! We excommunicate and imprison the small thief who steals the value of one day's labor; and fellowship and caress him, who robs a man of his wife, children, the earnings of his entire life, and often of life itself! We crown our banner with the emblem of *emancipation*,

"To wave
In splendid mockery o'er a land of slaves!"

Our clamorous democracy overturned an administration, because it passed a bill to restrain false and malicious publications found to be such by a jury; and this same democracy now adheres to two leaders, one of whom proposed, and the other by his casting vote passed, a bill to suppress, without any trial, every publication, however true and well intended, if it be in opposition to slavery! We denounce a certain trade as piracy, when it is carried on betwixt foreign ports, and protect the same trade when carried on betwixt our own! We pay luxurious slaveholders *promptly* for losses incurred in this piratical trade; and have withheld, for *forty years*, from free working men, compensation for similar losses incurred in honorable commerce!

This train of thought was revived to-day by visiting a slave-pen and prison of this city. The forlornness and filth; the naked floor for a bed; the iron-grated windows, without glass, and the thermometer at zero; the dirty and scanty blanket; the piled chains, handcuffs, and fetters; the deadly dejection of countenance—these had filled me with an oppressive sadness; and when I issued from the infernal den, and turned my face towards that stupendous sham, the capitol, with its "fustian flag," I felt an intensity of pain and disgust, which language cannot express. It cost me a struggle to reduce myself to that frame of mind, in which an abolitionist alone can do his work, and fulfill his mission of mercy to man.

I reached the capitol after a few minutes' walk, and felt it was a balm to my wounded spirit to hear Mr. Slade's firm, clear voice, propose the following forcible preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, by a law of the United States, passed on the the 15th of May, 1820, the foreign slave trade is declared to be piracy, and is made punishable by death:

And whereas, there is, and has long been, carried on in the District of Columbia, within sight of the halls of the two Houses of Congress, and the residence of the chief executive magistrate of this nation, a trade in men, involving all the principles of outrage on human rights which characterize the foreign slave trade, and which have drawn down upon it the maledictions of the civilized world, and stigmatized those engaged in it as enemies of the human race:

And whereas, the trade thus existing in this District is aggravated in enormity by reason of its being carried on in the heart of a nation whose institutions are based upon the principle that all men are created equal, and whose laws have, in effect, proclaimed its great and superlative iniquity; aggravated, moreover, by its outrage on the sensibilities of a Christian community—by its sundering the ties of Christian brotherhood, and by the anguish of its remorseless violation of all the domestic relations, rendered the more deep and enduring by the hallowing influence of the Christian religion upon those relations, and by the increased strength which it gives to the domestic affections:

And whereas, one of the purposes of the Constitution, in providing for the setting apart and exempting from State jurisdiction a district for the seat of the government of the United States, was to provide a common ground whereon all could meet, under a system of law not involving, of necessity, principles or usages peculiar to any of the States, but based upon the great principles asserted in the Declaration of Independence, and looking to the great objects contemplated in the preamble to the Constitution:

And whereas, that purpose of the Constitution is defeated, by subjecting a majority of the representatives of the people, and of the States, in the two Houses of Congress, and a majority of those employed in the executive departments at the seat of government, to the necessity of witnessing a trade in human beings, which is to them a source of grievous annoyance, and an object of deep abhorrence and detestation:

And whereas, this trade in human beings is carried on under the authority of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States, thereby involving the people of all the States in its guilt and disgrace—a guilt and disgrace enhanced by the consideration that these laws are a virtual usurpation of power—the Constitution of the United States having conferred upon Congress no right to establish the relation of slavery, or to sanction and protect the slave trade in any portion of this confederacy; therefore,

Resolved, That all laws in any way authorizing or sanctioning the slave trade in this District, ought to be repealed, and the trade prohibited; and that the committee on the District of Columbia be instructed to report a bill accordingly."

When the reading was finished, several slave members were on their feet, crying, "Mr. Speaker!" but Mr. Slade had the floor, and moved to suspend the *twenty-first rule*, for the purpose of now offering the resolution which had been read. Gov. Gilmer, of Virginia, endeavored to be heard; but the speaker gave the floor to Mr. A. V. Brown, of Tennessee, who, in his perturbation, moved to lay the motion to suspend on the table; but the speaker reminded him that it required only a majority to defeat that, while two-thirds were required to suspend the rule. With this, Mr. Brown and his brethren were tranquillized, and the yeas and nays were taken. As this was one of the most direct, and also, as I think, the most encouraging vote touching slavery, that we have ever had, I have made an analysis of it. I trust the people of the Free States, and particularly those honest democrats, who, for want of correct information, are supporting demagogues devoted to slavery, will look at this analysis. The slave-democrats of the free States are in *italics*; democrats in favor of freedom, from the same States, are in SMALL CAPITALS. Slave-whigs, of free States, are distinguished by a "lone star;" northern Tyler men, by *two* stars.

YEAS.

Maine.—BRONSON, Fessenden, Randall.
New Hampshire.—None.
Massachusetts.—Adams, Baker, Borden, Briggs, Burnell, Calhoun, Hudson, PARMENTER, Saltonstall, Winthrop.
Rhode Island.—Cranston, Tillinghast.
Connecticut.—Boardman, Osborne, Truman Smith, Trumbull.
Vermont.—Everett, Mattocks, Slade.
New-York.—Babcock, Barnard, Birdseye, Blair, Childs, Chittenden, J. C. Clark, S. N. Clarke, Fillmore, Gates, Granger, Hunt, Linn, Maynard, Morgan, Tomlinson, R. D. DAVIS, FERRIS, J. G. FLOYD, McKEON, OLIVER, PARTRIDGE, ROOSEVELT, SANFORD.
New Jersey.—Ayerygg, Halsted, Maxwell, Randolph, Stratton.
Pennsylvania.—J. Brown, J. Cooper, James, Henry, J. R. Ingersoll, McKennan, J. M. Russell, Toland, RAMSAY.
Delaware.—None.
Maryland.—None.
Virginia.—None.
North Carolina.—None.
South Carolina.—None.
Georgia.—None.
Kentucky.—None.
Tennessee.—None.
Ohio.—S. J. Andrews, Cowen, Giddings, P. G. GOODE, Mathiot, Morris, Morrow, Pendleton, Ridgway, W. Russell, Stokeley.
Louisiana.—None.
Indiana.—Cravens, J. L. White.
Mississippi.—None.
Illinois.—None.
Alabama.—None.
Missouri.—None.
Arkansas.—None.
Michigan.—None.

NAYS.

Maine.—*Clifford, Littlefield, Lowell, A. Marshall.*
New Hampshire.—*Burke, Eastman, Riding, Shaw.*
Massachusetts.—None.
Rhode Island.—None.
Connecticut.—None.
Vermont.—None.
New-York.—*Browne, Brewster, Clinton, C. A. Floyd, Gordon, Houck, Riggs, Ward, Wood.*
New Jersey.—None.
Pennsylvania.—*Beeson, Bidlack, C. Brown, Fornance, Gerry, C. J. Ingersoll,* Irwin,** *Jack, Keim, Marchand, Newhard, Plumer, Westbrook.*
Delaware.—Rodney.
Maryland.—W. C. Johnson.
Virginia.—Carey, Coles, Gilmer, Goggin, Harris, Hays, Hopkins, Hubbard, Hunter, J. W. Jones, Powell, Steenrod, A. H. H. Stuart, Summers, Taliaferro, Wise.
North Carolina.—Arrington, G. W. Caldwell, Daniel, Deberry, McKay, Rayner, Rencher, Saunders, Stanly, Washington.
South Carolina.—P. C. Caldwell, Pickens, Rhett, Rogers.
Georgia.—Black, M. A. Cooper, King, Meriwether.
Kentucky.—L. W. Andrews, Boyd, G. Davis, Green, T. F. Marshall, Owsley, Sprigg, J. B. Thompson, Triplett.
Tennessee.—Arnold, A. V. Brown, M. Brown, W. B. Campbell, T. J. Campbell, Caruthers, Gentry, C. Johnson, A. McClellan, Tierney, Watterson, J. L. Williams, C. H. Williams.
Ohio.—*Dean, Matthews, Medill, Sweney, Weller.*
Louisiana.—Dawson, Moore.
Indiana.—R. W. Thompson.*
Mississippi.—Gwin, J. Thompson.
Illinois.—*Casey, Reynolds,* J. T. Stuart.*
Alabama.—Chapman, Houston, Lewis, Payne, Shields.
Missouri.—J. C. Edwards, Miller.
Arkansas.—Cross.
Michigan.—None.

ABSENT.

Allen, Maine.
Atherton, New Hampshire.
Brockway, Williams, Connecticut.
Hall, A. Young, Vermont.
Foster, R. McClellan, Van Buren, Van Rensselaer, J. Young, New-York.
Yorke, New Jersey.
J. Edwards, Gustine, Irvin, Read, Simonton, Snyder, Pennsylvania.
Jones, Kennedy, Mason, Pearce, A. Randall, Sollers, J. W. Williams, Maryland.
Barton, Botts, Goode, Mallory, W. Smith, Virginia.
Graham, Mitchell, Shepperd, North Carolina.
W. Butler, J. Campbell, Holmes, Sumter, Trotti, South Carolina.
Colquitt, T. F. Foster, Gamble, Warren, Georgia.
W. O. Butler, Pope, Underwood, Kentucky.
Doan, Mason, Ohio.
E. D. White, Louisiana.
A. Kennedy, Lane, Proffit, Wallace, Indiana.
Howard, Michigan.

PRESENT, BUT NOT VOTING.

Cushing, Massachusetts.
Hastings, Ohio.

There may have been others "present, but not voting;" but if there were, I was not able to distinguish them.

RECAPITULATION.

Yeas.		Nays.	
Northern Whigs,	61	Northern Whigs,	2
Northern Democrats,	12	*Northern Democrats,*	36
		Northern Tyler men,	1
Total,	73	All the southerners,	72
		Total,	111

Majority against the motion, and in favor of continuing the slave trade in the District of Columbia, 38.

There are many things worthy of remark in this vote.

1st. Every southern member went for the continuance of the slave trade; in other words, (words of our laws,) "licensed" "piracy," at the seat of this government.

2d. *Three-fourths* of the northern Democrats went with them.

3d. The only northern Whigs who did so, are—one from Indiana, and one from Illinois; both said to be of *southern origin.*

4th. Those southern Whigs, who have heretofore given votes supposed to be favorable to liberty, have shown by their votes on this occasion, that their former course was dictated by mere policy; and that on any question touching the merits of any part of the slave system, we must not flatter ourselves with the expectation of correct and impartial action from any one of them. Those of them who have voted in favor of receiving and hearing our humble petitions, have undoubtedly done so upon the principle, openly and shamelessly avowed by Mr. Clay, in the Senate, that this was the easiest, and most politic method of silencing and suppressing them. Poor men! they are unable to form a conception of the indomitable energy and perseverance inspired by great thoughts, and an exalted purpose.

January 7.

Yesterday, the Senate passed a bill to distribute the residue of the money given by the British government for certain cargoes of democratic slaves lost from on board the Comet and Encomium. No opposition was made to it, and no discussion had. In the House, a bill for the same purpose has been on the calendar for some weeks, but Mr. Giddings objects to its passing without discussion. The case is this. The money paid by the British government was received by Mr. Forsyth, late Secretary of State. He proceeded to pay it over to claimants, without any legal regulation touching the matter, incurring therein considerable expense to the United States. About seven thousand dollars remained in his hands when he went out of office. This he passed to the treasury, where it now remains, and the object of the present bill is to take it out and complete the distribution. The objection made to the bill is, that the government has no right, under the Constitution, to negotiate indemnities for losses incurred in slave trading, to receive or pay moneys on account of such losses, or Congress to pass any regulation on the subject. On Friday, 6th, this bill coming up, Mr. Fillmore requested Mr. Giddings to withdraw his objection, remarking, that he [Mr. F.] was no more friendly to slavery than Mr. Giddings. The latter, however, declined to comply, and we may therefore expect a discussion of the subject.

During the week, Mr. Giddings presented eight petitions from Ohio against the gag rule. Also, for the repeal of all acts of Congress sustaining slavery. Also, a petition for the repeal of a law of this District, which allows slaves to be beheaded and quartered. Also, a petition for a law to allow trial by jury on the question of liberty or slavery. Also, the petition of David C. Eastman, of Fayette county, praying that Congress would cause to be procured, and placed in the library of Congress, a likeness of MADISON WASHINGTON.

Mr. Andrews, of Ohio, presented the petition of Lydia R. Finney, and two hundred and fifty other women of Loraine county, for the repeal of the twenty-first rule; of G. T. H. Stevens, and one hundred and sixty others, for the repeal of the third and fourth sections of the act of 1793, concerning foreign slaves; of G. Whipple, and one hundred and sixty others, praying for an amendment of the said act, so as to secure to fugitive slaves the right of trial by jury; of H. C. Taylor, and one hundred and sixty-two others, for the repeal of the gag rule; of George Whipple, and one hundred and sixty others, for the repeal of all laws of the United States for establishing and regulating slavery.

The debate upon the Bankrupt repeal bill still continues, and turns upon all the points of controversy between political parties.

A new debate of great interest has sprung up in the morning hour respecting the reimbursement of the fine levied on General Jackson for a contempt of court, committed during the continuance of his martial law at New Orleans. This is a democratic movement. Mr. Adams, in the beginning of a speech on this subject, on Friday last, stated that it was rumored that the differences between the two divisions of the party called democratic, were to be decided by General Jackson, who was to preside over the democratic national convention. He said that in the great auction, which was going on, both fragments of "the party," were bidding for General Jackson's favor, or his neutrality, and perhaps the recommendation of the President to refund the fine, was a bid. He would not say that it was. An attempt was made on Thursday to carry the reimbursement bill with a "hurra." Mr. Cushing, of Massachusetts, made, in favor of the measure, a speech of uncommon ingenuity and elegance, but as foreign as nullification from the feelings and the constitutional faith of his constituents and his State. Mr. Adams made a masterly reply, and the motion to go into committee of the whole for the purpose of reporting the bill, was negatived—yeas 100, nays 106. I thought this victory was worth more to the country than the victory of New Orleans. The most curious part of this affair is, that Jackson himself has taken the field to fight the matter through. The party which has the majority in Congress appear perfectly willing that he should have the money, provided they are allowed so to guard the bill that no inference can be drawn from it unfavorable to the honor of the judge, or the legality and propriety of the proceedings. Such terms the democrats reject, and the old hero himself proclaims to be insulting. He means to make the act of Congress, however it shall pass, a virtual reversal of the judgment of the court. The old gentleman is said to be poor, having met with heavy losses by endorsements.

January 8.

Lucretia Mott was expected to-day to preach in the hall of the representatives, but I have just learned that the speaker required, as a condition of granting leave, that she should say nothing on "the exciting topic." Is not this miserable? It seems as if we had already arrived at that state of imbecility, which Rome was eight hundred years in reaching, and that we already need an invasion of Goths and Vandals to infuse some manhood into our blood. I scarcely need say that the offer, coupled with the gag, was rejected.—D. L. C.

OUR UTICA CORRESPONDENT.

Will this highly esteemed friend excuse me for not publishing his communication? I do it simply on the ground that I have no faith in the usefulness of warfare, even when it is purely defensive. When correspondents find me defending *myself*, they will have good ground to complain that I do not defend *them*. Till then, I hope they will believe in my impartiality, if they do not agree with my judgment. The following sentence from our friend's letter says all that *needs* to be said. Those who know him, will have implicit faith in his integrity and truthfulness; those who do not know him, and who dislike to believe his statements, will believe him none the more, for all that he can say.

He says: "My venerable friend, of the Utica Gazette, refers to my former communication, in which the mobocratic spirit developed at a meeting at the court-house was alluded to, and charges me with misrepresentation, &c. All I need say is, it's a question of veracity between us, and I am perfectly willing to submit the decision, to those who were present on the occasion. I gave the facts just as they presented themselves to my view, and hundreds of our fellow-citizens concur in that statement."

ABOLITIONISTS OF NEW-YORK, BE VIGILANT!

Virginia and South Carolina have, of late, thrown out many boasts that they would rule the roost in the New-York legislature, as soon as the *democrats* came into power; that the "natural allies of the South" would doubtless redress their wrongs. The extract which we give from Governor Bouck's message, shows that, so far as he is concerned, they have not reckoned without their host. He very distinctly advocates the repeal of the laws in favor of freedom, passed under the administration of Governor Seward. There is reason to apprehend that efforts will be made in the legislature to carry out the views of the new governor, and thereby make New-York a more convenient hunting-ground for the slaveholder. *Let abolitionists be watchful!* they should be well prepared with petitions to meet any demonstration that may be made toward a re-enactment of slave laws. Should their representatives attempt to do anything so unwise and iniquitous, it will be the duty of freemen to remonstrate in language that will be *understood*. THE EMPIRE STATE MUST NEVER AGAIN BECOME SUBSERVIENT TO THE BARBAROUS SLAVE CODE OF THE SOUTH. *Be vigilant!* See to it, that they do not, by adroit management, and patriotic pretenses, catch the weasel asleep.

AMUSING SIMPLICITY.

Dr. Samuel Stanhope Smith, published a book of 400 pages, in 1810, to prove the unity of the human race; that all races descended from one man, and had been changed by the effect of climate. In proof of this, he says: "*The negro slaves at the South, who live in white families, are gradually found to conform in features to the whites with whom they live.*"

The learned writer seems never to have heard of "*amalgamation.*" When he wrote, the word was not in such common use as it now is.

THE LIBERTY BELL.

The fourth number of this anti-slavery annual has come out in an enlarged form, and nicer materials. It was printed by Oliver Johnson, and does great credit to his neatness and taste. It contains an admirable likeness of Dr. Follen, and several highly interesting articles. The following is a list of the writers: Lord Morpeth, John Bowring, Harriet Martineau, and Richard M. Milnes, of England; Richard D. Webb, and Richard Allen, of Ireland; John Pierpont, Eliza L. Follen, W. L. Garrison, Edmund Quincy, Isaac T. Hopper, Wendell Phillips, M. W. Chapman, Anne W. Weston, Henry I. Bowditch, son of the late Dr. Bowditch, Wm. H. Channing, son of the late Dr. Channing, W. W. Story, son of Judge Story, Theodore Parker, the renowned transcendentalist, Dr. S. G. Howe, known far and wide for his philanthropic efforts for the blind, James Russell Lowell, John Parkman, John A. Collins, D. L. Child, and L. M. Child.

I have mentioned the parentage and reputation of some of the writers, not as a matter of ostentation, but simply for the information of country readers, who like to know what is being done for the anti-slavery cause by men of whom they have heard in other departments of benevolence, science, or literature.

THE COVENANT WITH JUDAS.—Don't fail to read every word of the extract from this eloquent and well-argued discourse, by John Pierpont. That brave man towers above his time-serving brethren, like a giant among pigmies.

ERRATA.

In the "Reply to a Letter from a Clergymen of the Episcopal Church," in the last Standard, the following typographical errors occurred:

In the 15th line from the beginning read, "more *obvious* and imperative," instead of "more *obnoxious*" &c.

In line 28th, read "how I *know*," instead of "how I *think*."

In line 17, from the bottom of the first column, read "the *invariable* attendant on personal righteousness," instead of the "*inalienable* attendant.

In line 56, from the bottom of the 2d column, read "their own *numerical* strength," instead of "their own *municipal* strength."

PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION.—The records of this meeting arrived too late to be inserted last week, without putting our printers to a good deal of trouble, which we were reluctant to do, on New Years' week, when most of them wanted a holiday. We rejoice to hear that the meeting was largely attended, very spirited, and evidently productive of much good.

Anti-Slavery Items.

FRANCE.—Joseph Sturge, in a letter from Paris, says: "The aspect of the abolition cause in France is quite discouraging, notwithstanding the professions of Guizot to Thomas Clarkson and others. I fear he will do nothing. Indeed, I expect the king of France will not have any minister who is not completely subservient to him; and he is so much against us, that I doubt if there is much chance of the abolition of slavery in the French colonies, until after his death."

MORE BLUSTER.—At an adjourned meeting in Norfolk, Va. in reference to the case of the slave Latimer, one of the speakers, S. T. Sawyer, esq. strongly advocated an appeal to the legislature, to provide for the defense of the State, by placing *its militia in a condition for actual and efficient service.* He viewed the stand taken by the citizens of the northern States as in direct hostility to the constitutional rights of those of the South; and, sooner or later, the question must be brought to an issue, whether the latter would consent to remain in the Union, crushed and humbled as they must be, or withdraw from it; and it was the right course for Virginia to prepare, in time, for this momentous decision.

The query is, who the militia will find to fight with. According to the old adage, "It takes two to fight."

THE SLAVE TRADE.—Public attention has been much excited by a despatch which Lord Aberdeen has addressed to the lords of the admiralty, conveying the opinion of the queen's advocate, "that the blockading rivers, landing and destroying buildings, and carrying off persons held in slavery, in countries with which Great Britain is not at war, cannot be considered as sanctioned by the law of nations, or by the provisions of any existing treaties." These practices will, of course, be discontinued, and the system of armed suppression of the slave trade, ineffectual always, become still more ineffectual. *We* are very little concerned in this matter; inasmuch as the method of armed intervention is altogether repudiated by us. The only observation we have to offer is, that every demonstration of the inefficiency of coercive modes of putting down the slave trade, attaches increasing value and importance to the use of those which—in the words of the constitution of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society—are "moral, religious, and pacific."—*British and Foreign Rep.*

COLORED LITERATI.—The Paris correspondent of the National Intelligencer mentions that Alexandre Dumas, one of the most celebrated literary characters of France, is a full mulatto, his father being a complete negro, from one of the West India islands. He was, nevertheless, a general of artillery; and in literature, his son is deemed second only to Victor Hugo. It is said that an American gentleman, being invited to dinner, found himself placed on an equality with a colored man, slipped away as soon as possible, complaining bitterly that he was placed at table next a mulatto! Dumas, it is said, is about to receive the distinguished honor of being elected a member of the French Institute; an honor to which the American gentleman would aspire in vain.

AMERICAN INDIAN SLAVEHOLDERS.—The Indian tribes, on the Mexican frontier, hold slaves; one of these people, a wealthy man, has one hundred. The United States government, which has located them there, has no objection to this, as it turns their inclinations more to Texas than to Mexico.—*British and Foreign Reporter.*

A PECULIARLY AMERICAN CURIOSITY.—D. L. Child, giving an account of the National Institute, at Washington, in a letter to the Liberator, says: "Among the rarities of the museum is one which, I venture to say, can be found in none of the royal and imperial collections of Europe. This single gem imparts to brother Jonathan a distinction, of which no establishment or nation is capable of depriving him. It is one which he can never lose, except by voluntary renunciation. The following is a literal copy of the label attached to this precious object. I am indebted for my knowledge of it, to the attention which it had attracted among some of the members of Congress:

'SKIN OF AN AFRICAN, TANNED IN GEORGETOWN, PRESENTED BY THE *Rev.* JAMES CURLEY, GEO. COLLEGE, July 7, 1842.'

Now, in the name of all the *ologies* at once, what is it put here for? was my first thought. But other thoughts came. The donor, either bent upon uttering through this emblem a biting satire upon this magnificent sham of *democracy*, which a certain demagogue historian has declared to be *Christianity* itself; or else impelled by a divine *afflatus*, by professed philosophical reflection, did certainly hit off herein an expressive epitome of American humanity and piety! 'Skin of an African,' 'tanned' 'and presented by a *Rev.*'! If there be not an exquisite nationality in this, I will never guess again."

TREASURER'S RECEIPTS

(*For the four weeks, ending 1st mo. (Jan.) 10th, 1843.*)

Received for the Standard.—The following persons have each paid $2:—Dr. S. J. Howe, Boston; Greenfield Iden, Ledyard; James S. Peregrine, Wilmington, Ohio; William Bassett, Lynn; Richard H. Francis, Utica, N. Y.; Jefferson Church, Springfield, Mass.; J. D. Richmond, Ashford, Ct.; Theophilus Chandler, do.; Carpenter & Hicks, do.; E. B. Hibbard, do.; W. B. Edmondson, Richmond, Ind.; John Lake, South Woodstock, Vt.; F. H. Hedge, Bangor, Me.; H. Ball, sen. Leesville, Ohio; Ellison Conger, Newark, N. J.; Rev. E. O. Sewell, Scituate, Mass.; Benjamin Lincoln, Boston; Daniel F. Child, do.; Benjamin Merrill, Salem, Mass.; Dr. J. Bartlett, Concord, Mass.; Mrs. Sophia Bradford, Eliza W. Scott, Leatherwood, Ohio; Clark Spalding, Borodino, N. Y.; Arnold S. Congdon, New Bedford, Mass.; Mary B. Macy, Nantucket; Clark Carpenter, Utica, N. Y; Reuben Dean, Macedon Centre, N. Y.; Louisa A. Allen, Dedham, Mass.; Joshua Perry, Hanson, Mass.; Mary Ann Bishop, Warren, Mass.; Olive H. Tucker, do.; Solomon Overacre, Newville, N. Y.; J. M. Binghardt, Little Falls, N. Y.; Polly Brown, Oppenheimer, N. Y.; Samuel Potter, Princeton, Mass.; Joab Petree, Little Falls, N. Y.; B. Swan, Newport, R. I.; Nathan C. Gove, Lincoln, Vt.; Josephine Hayne, Belmont, Ohio. Almon Walcot, Shoreham, Vt.; C. A. Coleman, N. Y.; Hosea Trumbull, Upton, Mass.; E. D. Draper, Milford, Mass.

Charles Summer, Boston, $3; William Goslin, Winthrop, Me. $1; Mexican consul general, New-York, $26; Patience Smith, New-York city, $1; Dr F Winslow, Nantucket, $1; Messenger & Burton, Norwich, Vt, $1; George Barrett, Delaware, Ohio, $3; Peter Wilson, New-York city, 50 cts; Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, $200; J Holcomb, Brandon, Vt, $1; Daniel Stewart, East Lyme, Ct. $1; R D Sharp, Abington, Ct, $1 50; E Griffin, Hampton, Ct, $1 50; Charles Griffin, do $1 50; Wm Martin, Chaplin, Ct, 75 cts; Schuyler R Lily, Mansfield, Ct, $1; Henry Coe, Westford, Ct. $1 67; Marvin Burnham, Hampton, Ct, $1 67; S Coleman, New-York city, $1; Mr Atkinson, Brooklyn, L. I., 50 cts; Nantucket pledge, $100; Mary B Swayne, Leatherwood, Ohio, $1; Jonas Bennett, Charlestown, Mass, $1; Wm Durfee, New Bedford, Mass, $1; E Bogardus, Macedon Centre N Y $2 50; Lorenzo Hathaway, Farmington, N Y 50 cts; Eunice Dorman, Kennebunk, Me. $1 25; Henry Clapp, Scituate, Mass, 50 cts; Miss Dowden, Cork, Ireland, $2 50; Mrs Mannix, Dyke parade, Cork, Ireland, $2 50; Thomas Webb, Dublin Ireland, $2 50; B C Fisher, Limerick, do $5; Isabella Jennings, Cork, do $2 50; R D Webb, Dublin, do $2 50; James Haughton, Dublin, do $4 75; S & W Treat, West Prospect, Me, $1; William Frye, Vassalboro, Me, $1; Charles Fountain, Mendon, N Y, $1; Lewis Taber, and others, Mount Pleasant, Ohio, $5; Eastern Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, $175; Basil Banks, New-York city, $1.

☞ The donations are omitted for want of room.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

General Items.

Strange Proceedings!—News has arrived here from the west, of the occupation of Monterey, a town in California, by Commodore Jones, of the frigate United States and Corvette Cyane. He held the town about two days, and then gave it up, declaring that he took the town in consequence of a report that war was declared by the United States against Mexico.

Interesting Law Case.—The owners, in Richmond, of the *Creole* slaves, have sued the New Orleans insurance offices, for the amount of the insurance on the negroes, $60,000, and the first legal talent in the city is engaged in the case.

Death by Suffocation.—A fire broke out, at about 4 in the morning, in the Hickory Public House, New-York. A girl, about twenty years old, after leaving the house, returned for her clothes, and perished by suffocation. She was to have been married that day. An Irishman, who went in to rescue her, likewise perished.

Henry Clay.—New Orleans has lately given a most splendid reception to Henry Clay. The sugar brokers erected a flagstaff sixty feet high on their platform, in front of the custom-house, sustaining a banner, one side of which appears, "Welcome to Henry Clay!—Protective Tariff on Sugar!" and on the reverse, "*The Planters' Friend*"

The Texans were particularly conspicuous for their attentions to the man "opposed to all emancipation, gradual or immediate." All the Texan vessels at New Orleans fired salutes on his arrival.

J. Q. Adams.—A letter from Washington to the New-York American, says, "The glorious old man looks likely to see many a happy New Year yet. He seems quite easy and unexcitable this session; but all who are familiar with his appearance, remark that he looks unusually vigorous and fresh."

A Manly Opponent.—Mr. A. H. H. Stuart, of Virginia, has written a letter to his constituents, declining a renomination to Congress. He is

Poetry.

From the Liberty Bell.

CHRISTIAN ENDURANCE.

To Harriet Martineau, while ill of a disease supposed to be incurable.

BY RICHARD MONCKTON MILNES.

Mortal, that standest on a point of time,
With an eternity on either hand,
Thou hast one duty, above all sublime:
Where thou art placed, *serenely* there to stand.

To stand undaunted by the threatening death,
Or harder circumstance of living doom,
Nor less untempted by the odorous breath
Of hope, that issues even from the tomb.

For hope will never dull the present pain,
Nor fear will ever keep thee safe from fall,
Unless thou hast in thee a mind to reign
Over thyself—as God is over all.

'Tis well in deeds of good, though small, to thrive;
'Tis well some part of ill, though small, to cure;
'Tis well with onward, upward hope, to strive;
Yet better and diviner, to *endure*.

What but this virtue's solitary power,
Through all the lusts and dreams of Greece and Rome,
Bore the selected spirits of their hour
Safe to a distant, immaterial home?

But in *that* patience was the seed of scorn—
Scorn of the world, and brotherhood of man;
Not patience, such as in the manger born,
Up to the cross endured its earthly span.

Thou must endure! yet loving all the while;
Above, yet never *separate* from thy kind;
Meet every frailty with a tender smile,
Though to no possible depth of evil blind.

This is the riddle thou hast life to solve;
And in the task thou shalt not work alone;
For, while the worlds about the sun revolve,
God's heart and mind are ever with his own.

From the German of Langbein.

HABICH AND HATTICH.

"A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."

There are two little songsters well known in the land,
Their names are *I-have* and *O-had-I*;
I-have will come tamely and perch on your hand,
But *O-had-I* will mock you most sadly.

I-have, at first sight, is less fair to the eye,
But his worth is by far more enduring
Than a thousand *O-had-I's*, that sit far and high,
On roofs and on trees so alluring.

Full many a golden egg this bird will lay,
And sing you, "Be cheery! be cheery!"
O, merrily, then, will the day glide away,
And sweet shall your sleep be, when weary.

But let an *O-had-I* once take your eye,
And a longing to catch him once seize you,—
He'll give you no comfort nor rest till you die;
Life-long he'll torment you and tease you.

He'll keep you all day running up and down hill,
Now racing, now panting and creeping;
While far overhead, this sweet bird, at his will,
With his golden plumage is sweeping.

Then every wise man who attends to my song,
Will count his *I-have* a choice treasure,
And, whene'er an *O-had-I* comes flying along,
Will just let him fly at his pleasure.

From the Liberty Bell.

TO VISCOUNT MORPETH.

An impromptu, on receiving his letter published in the Liberty Bell.

BY M. W. CHAPMAN.

Paused the "Blanche Lion," when he reached the border,
Though scoffing wardens fiercely gave him warning?
Sternley he nerved him at the insulting order,
The deadly brunt of feudal warfare scorning.
And now, when broader, holier fields before him
Stretch far into the depths of coming ages,
Summoning forth the blood that watches o'er him,
Where moral strife the immortal soul engages,
Shall *names* and *nations* keep that banner furled?
Thy foray guiltless—be thy field the WORLD!

From the Liberty Bell.

SONNET.

BY WILLIAM W. STORY.

Be of good cheer, ye firm and dauntless few,
Whose struggle is to work an unloved good!
Ye shall be taunted by revilings rude,
Ye shall be scorned for that which ye pursue!
Yet faint not—but be ever strict and true.
Greatness must learn to be misunderstood;
And persecution is their bitter food,
Who the great promptings of the spirit do.
Though no one seem to hear, yet every word
That thou hast linked unto an earnest thought,
Hath fiery wings, and shall be clearly heard,
When thy frail lips to silent dust are brought.
God's guidance keeps those noble thoughts, that chime
With the great harmony beyond all Time!

SONNET.

BY WORDSWORTH.

Feel for the wrongs to universal ken,
Daily exposed—wo that unshrouded lies;
And seek the sufferer in his darkest den,
Whether conducted to the spot by sighs
And moanings, or he dwells (as if the wren
Taught him concealment) hidden from all eyes,
In silence, and the awful modesties
Of sorrow;—feel for *all*, as brother men!—
Feel for the poor,—but not to still your qualms,
By formal charity, or dole of alms;
Learn to be just—just through impartial law;
Far as ye may, erect and equalize;
And what ye cannot reach by statute, draw
Each from his fountain of self-sacrifice!

From Longfellow's Poems on Slavery.

THE WARNING.

Beware! the Israelite of old, who tore
The lion in his path—when, poor and blind,
He saw the blessed light of heaven no more,
Shorn of his noble strength, and forced to grind
In prison, and at last led forth to be
A pander to Philistine revelry—

Upon the pillars of the temple laid
His desperate hands, and in its overthrow
Destroyed himself, and with him those who made
A cruel mockery of his sightless wo;
The poor, blind slave, the scoff and jest of all,
Expired, and thousands perished in the fall!

There is a poor, blind Samson in this land,
Shorn of his strength, and bound in bonds of steel,
Who may, in some grim revel, raise his hand,
And shake the pillars of this commonweal,
Till the vast temple of our liberties
A shapeless mass of wreck and rubbish lies.

Miscellany.

MARTHA WASHINGTON.

BY MRS. SIGOURNEY.

The state of society in Virginia, a century since, was unique and imposing. The "Ancient Dominion" retained stronger features of resemblance to the father land, than any of its sisters. The manners of the nobility of England had been transplanted, with little radical change, to the territory of Powhattan:—A kind of feudal magnificence, a high and quick sense of honor, a generous and lordly hospitality, early characterized a State which has given to this western empire so many of its mightiest and noblest names.

One of the most immediate changes arising from the severance from the mother country, was the breaking down of that courtly and almost solemn etiquette which had marked the intercourse of the higher classes. "I know your age by the *edition of your manners*," said a lady of discernment to a gentleman distinguished for politeness. "I am certain that you were educated before the revolution." But the republicanism which may have possibly swept with too full a tide over our national manners, had, at the period of which we speak, no existence in Virginia. The levees of her royal governors, though stripped of monarchial pomp, displayed a remnant of those "stately steppings of chivalry," with which the titled and valiant, of a still earlier age, were accustomed, in European courts, to pay homage to beauty and to rank.

It was early in the winter of 1748, that the levees of Governor Gooch opened with unwonted splendor at Williamsburgh. Many of the members of the assembly took thither with them a part of their families, and this session was graced by the presence of several young high-born maidens, who had never before been presented at court. One among them was evidently the theme of general admiration. Some of the statelier matrons criticised her as deficient in height. But, though somewhat beneath the middle stature, she possessed that round and exquisite symmetry, which the earlier historians have ascribed to the fascinating Anne Boleyn. A pure complexion, and clear eye, were finely contrasted with dark, glossy, and redundent hair. Still, it was found difficult, by common observers, to analyze her beauty; for it rested not on any predominant gift, but on the consent of the whole person in loveliness. Grace of movement, and melody of voice, were confessed to be among its elements. More of animation was hers, than is wont to distinguish the modern southern beauty; but what chiefly won old and young, was a bland cheerfulness, the silent history of the soul's happiness, and an expressive smile, inspiring every beholder with confidence, like a beam from the temple of truth.

Though she had scarcely numbered twice eight summers, there was about her a womanly dignity, which chastened forward admiration into respect.

Among those who paid their *devoirs* to this lovely young creature, was Col. Custis, one of the most accomplished gentlemen of his time. His father, the Hon. John Custis, of Arlington, held the office of king's counselor, and was a man of wealth and distinction. His attendance at Williamsburg, during the present session, had been somewhat interrupted by ill-health; and while there, the graver duties of the statesman had so far absorbed him, as to leave him ignorant what reigning beauties had produced sensation at court. Not long after the suspension of the levees, and the return of the burgesses to their homes, the counselor requested a conversation, in his private cabinet, with his son, Colonel Daniel Parke Custis. There was a singular mixture of gravity and condescension in his manner, as he desired him to be seated, and thus opened the discourse:

"I have for some time wished to see you on an interesting subject. Though still young, I consider you to have arrived at years of discretion."

The colonel bowed.

"I trust I have always shown that regard for your welfare, which is due from an affectionate father to an only son. I am about to give another proof of it. In short, I wish you to turn your attention to a suitable marriage."

The colonel bowed.

"You know Colonel Byrd, of Westever, to be my very particular friend. His daughter is one of the most beautiful and accomplished ladies in Virginia. It is my desire that you form with her a matrimonial alliance."

"My dear sir, I have not the vanity of supposing that I could render myself acceptable to Miss Byrd."

"No objection on that head. Her father and myself have settled it. Indeed, I may as well tell you that we have had numberless conversations on this business, and that you have both been as betrothed from the cradle. Think, my son, of the advantages of such a connection, the contiguity of wealth and power that will ultimately pass into your hands."

"Affection, sir, seems to me to be the only bond that can hallow so intimate a union. Not even my reverence for the best of fathers could induce me to enter into it from mercenary motives."

"Mercenary, sir; *mercenary!* Whoever, before, dared to couple that word with my name?" exclaimed the counselor, raising himself to his full height, and fixing a kindling eye upon his son.

Then, pacing the apartment a few turns, he stopped opposite to him, and added, "You speak of the affection that should precede marriage. Have the goodness to understand that the misplacing of yours may materially affect your patrimonial inheritance." He seemed to wait for a reply, but in vain. "May I inquire, if you have thought fit, thus early, to decide seriously on the preference of any young lady as a companion for life?"

"I have, sir."

"May I be favored with a knowledge of her name?"

"Miss Martha Dandridge."

The high-spirited gentlemen parted in mutual resentment; but the reflection of a night restored them to better feelings. The father began to excuse the son, by recalling the warmth of his own early attachment; while the son referred the testiness of the father to the harrowing disappointment of a long-cherished plan, and to the querulousness of feeble health. Still, as it usually happens with proud men, neither opened his heart to the other;—and a slight, though almost imperceptible shade of coldness gathered over their intercourse. But this interview served as a stimulent to the progress of matrimony. The temporary reserve of the father, throwing something like gloom over the paternal mansion, heightened the frequency and fervor of the visits of the lover. The gentle object of his preference imagined no barrier to an alliance, where there existed no obvious inequality; and he forebore to communicate what would only occasion perplexity, and what he trusted would soon vanish like the "baseless fabric of a vision." According to his happy prescience, the lofty counselor gave his consent to the nuptials, and the flower of the court of Williamsburg became a bride, in the blush of her seventeenth summer.

Their residence was a retired and romantic mansion on the banks of the Pamunkey. It reared its white walls amid a profusion of vines and flowering trees. Broad plantations, and the wealth of Virginia forests, variegated the grounds. Rural occupation, and the delight of each other's society, prepared for them what they deemed a paradise. In visits to their favored dwelling, the counselor learned to appreciate the treasures of his new daughter. Her excellence in the responsible sphere to which she was introduced, won his regard; and with the ingenuousness of an honorable mind, when convinced of error, he sought every opportunity of distinguishing that merit, which he had once been reluctant to admit. When he saw the grace and courteousness with which she maintained a generous hospitality; the judgment, far beyond her years, displayed in the management of her servants; the energy, the early rising, the cheerful alacrity with which she regulated and beautified the internal mechanism of her family; the disinterestedness with which she forgot herself, and sought the good of others; but, above all, her untiring devotion to her husband, and to the little ones who sprang up around her; he gloried in the sentiment of his son, which, indeed, he had always believed, though he was once in danger of swerving from it, that strong personal affection is essential to the basis of matrimonial happiness.

But the scene of exquisite felicity was not long to last. The death of her two eldest children prepared the way for a deeper loss of her beloved and estimable husband. In the trying situation of a young, beautiful, and wealthy widow, and mother, she was still enabled to conduct herself with unvarying discretion, and faithfully to discharge every important duty.

It was in the spring of 1758, that two gentlemen, attended by a servant, were seen riding through the luxuriant scenery with which the country of New Kent, in Virginia, abounds. The most striking figure of the group was tall, graceful, and apparently twenty-five or twenty-six years of age. He would have been held a model for statuary when Rome was in her best days. His companion was an elderly man, in a plain garb, who, by the familiarity with which he pointed out surrounding objects, would seem to be taking his daily rounds upon his own estate. As they approached the avenue to an antique mansion, he placed his hand upon the rein of his companion.

"Nay, Colonel Washington, let it never be said that you passed the house of your father's friend without dismounting. I must insist upon the honor of detaining you as my guest."

"Thanks to you, my dear sir, but I ride in haste, the bearer of despatches to our governor in Williamsburg, which may not brook delay."

"Is this the noble steed which was given you by the dying Braddock, on the fatal field of Monongahela? and this the servant which he bequeathed you at the same time?"

Washington answered in the affirmative.

"Then, my dear colonel, thus mounted and attended, you may well dine with me, and by borrowing somewhat of this fine moonlight, reach Williamsburg ere his excellency shall have shaken off his morning slumbers."

"Do I understand that I may be excused immediately after dinner?"

"Certainly."

"Then, sir, I accept your hospitality;" and gracefully throwing himself from the charger, he resigned the rein to his English servant, giving, at the same time, strict orders as to the hour when he must be ready with the horses to pursue their journey.

"I am rejoiced, Colonel Washington," said the hospitable old gentleman, "thus fortunately to have met you on my morning ride; and the more so, as I have some guests, who may make the repast pass pleasantly, and will not fail to appreciate our young and valiant soldier."

Washington bowed his thanks, and was introduced to the company. Virginia's far-famed hospitality was well set forth in that spacious baronial hall. Precise in his household regulations, the social feast, was closed at the time the host had predicted. The servant also was punctual. He knew the habits of his master. At the appointed moment, he stood, with horses caparisoned, at the gate; and much did he marvel, as listening to every footstep that paced down the avenue, he saw the sun sink in the west, and yet no master appear. At length orders came that the horses should be put up for the night. Wonder upon wonder! when his business with the governor was so urgent! The sun was high in the heavens the next day, ere Washington mounted for his journey. No explanation was given. But it was rumored, that among the guests was a beautiful and youthful widow, to whose charms his heart had responded. This was further confirmed by his tarrying but a brief space at Williamsburg, retracing his route with unusual celerity, and becoming a frequent visitor at the house of the late Colonel Custis, in that vicinity, where the following year, his nuptials were celebrated.

Henceforth, the life of the lady of Mount Vernon is a part of the history of her country. In that hallowed retreat she was found entering into the plans of Washington, sharing his confidence, and making his household happy. There, her only daughter, Martha Custis, died in the bloom of youth; and a few years after, when the troubles of the country drew her husband to the post of commander-in-chief of her armies, she accompanied him to Boston, and witnessed its siege and evacuation. For eight years, he returned no more to enjoy his beloved residence on the banks of the Potomac. During his absence, she made the most strenuous efforts to discharge the added weight of care, and to endure, with changeless trust in Heaven, continued anxiety for the safety of one so inexpressibly dear. At the close of each campaign, she repaired, in compliance with his wishes, to head-quarters, where the ladies of the general officers joined her in forming such society as diffused a cheering influence over even the gloom of the winter of Valley-Forge and Morristown. The opening of every campaign was the signal of the return of Lady Washington, (as she was called in the army,) to her domestic cares at Mount Vernon. "I heard," said she, "the first and the last cannon of the revolutionary war." The rejoicings which attended the surrender of Cornwallis, in the autumn of 1781, marked, for her, a season of the deepest sorrow. Her only remaining child, Colonel John Custis, the aid-de-camp of Washington, became during his arduous duties at the siege of Yorktown, the victim of an epidemic fever, and died at the age of twenty-seven. He was but a boy of five years, at the time of her second marriage, and had drawn forth strongly the affection and regard of her illustrious husband, who shared her affliction for his loss, and by the tenderest sympathy strove to alleviate it.

After the close of the war, a few years were devoted to the enjoyment and embellishment of their favorite Mount Vernon. The peace and returning prosperity of their country gave pure and bright ingredients to their cup of happiness. Their mansion was thronged with guests of distinction, all of whom remarked, with admiration, the energy of Mrs. Washington, in the complicated duties of a Virginia housewife, and the elegance and grace with which she presided at her noble board.

The voice of a free nation, conferring on General Washington the highest honor in its power to bestow, was not obeyed without a sacrifice of feeling. It was in the spring of 1789, that, with his lady, he bade adieu to his tranquil abode, to assume the responsibility of the first presidency. In forming his domestic establishment, he mingled the simplicity of a republic with that degree of dignity which he felt was necessary to secure the respect of older governments. The furniture of his house, the livery of his servant, the entertainment of his guests, displayed elegance, while they rejected ostentation. In all these arrangements, Mrs. Washington was a second self. Her Friday evening levees, at which he was always present, exhibited that perfect etiquette which marks the intercourse of the dignified and high bred. Commencing at seven, and closing at ten, they lent no more sanction to late hours than to levity. The first lady of the nation still preserved the habits of early life. Indulging in no indolence, she left her pillow at dawn, and after breakfast retired to her chamber an hour, for the study of the scriptures and devotion. This practice, it is said, during the long period of half a century, she never omitted. The duties of the Sabbath were dear to her. The president and herself attended public worship with regularity, and in the evening he read to her, in her chamber, the scriptures and a sermon.

The spring of 1797 opened for them with the most pleasing anticipations. The cares of high office were resigned, and they were about to retire, for the remainder of their days, to the beloved shades of Mount Vernon. The new turf springing into fresh greenness wherever they trod, the vernal blossoms opening to receive them, the warbled welcome of the birds, were never more dear, as wearied with the toils of public life, and satiated with its honors, they returned to their rural retreat, hallowed by the recollections of earlier years, and by the consciousness of virtue.

But in two years Washington was no more. The shock of his death, after an illness of only twenty-four hours, fell like a thunderbolt upon the bereaved widow. The piety which had long been her strength, continued its support, but her heart drooped; and though her cheerfulness did not utterly forsake her, she discharged her habitual round of duties, as one who felt that the "glory had departed."

How beautiful and characteristic was her reply to the solicitations of the highest authority of the nation, that the remains of her illustrious husband might be removed to the seat of government, and a marble monument erected to mark the spot of their repose:

"Taught by the great example which I have had so long before me, never to oppose my private wishes to the will of my country, I consent to the request made by Congress; and in doing this, I need not, *I cannot*, say what a sacrifice of individual feeling I make to a sense of public duty."

The intention of the Congress of 1797 has never been executed, nor the proposed monument erected. The enthusiasm of the time passed away, and the many and conflicting cares of a great nation turned its thought from thus perpetuating his memory, whose image, it trusted, would be ever enshrined in the hearts of a great people.

Scarcely two years of her lonely widowhood were accomplished, ere the lady of Mount Vernon found death approaching. Gathering her family around her, she impressed on them the value of that religion which she had tested from her youth onward to hoary hairs. Then calmly resigning her soul into the hands of him who gave it, at the age of seventy, full of years and full of honors, she was laid in the tomb of Washington.

In this outline of the lineaments of Martha Washington, we perceive that it was neither the beauty with which she was endowed, nor the high station which she had attained, that gave enduring lustre to her character; but her Christian fidelity in those duties which devolve upon her sex. These fitted her to irradiate the home, to lighten the cares, to cheer the anxieties, to sublimaje the enjoyments, of him who, in the expressive language of Chief Justice Marshall, was, "so favored of Heaven, as to depart without exhibiting the weakness of humanity."

From the Boston Mercantile Journal.

TEA.

This is an important article of commerce. Every civilized nation annually expends immense sums for this herb, which is brought exclusively from China, at a great expense. Its infusion constitutes an agreeable, but by no means a nutritious beverage, which is indulged in by people of all conditions and classes. The force of habit seems to transform *tea*, which was wont to be regarded as a *luxury*, into one of the most important *necessaries* of life. It is said that the habitual use of tea is injurious to the constitution; but that which is in general use, as an every-day beverage, by more than four hundred millions of people, cannot possess any noxious properties, in a very high degree; notwithstanding, its occasional abuse may serve to show that it is capable of injuring those who take it to excess.

According to d'Israeli, tea was used in England, in the time of Oliver Cromwell; but according to other accounts, tea was introduced into Europe by the Dutch, and conveyed to England from Holland, about the year 1660. It was some time, however, before its rare qualities, and excellent flavor, were discovered and appreciated. But as it was regarded as a costly luxury, fashion subsequently brought it into use; and, in a few years, it became more generally and extensively used. In 1670, the importation of teas into England amounted to only seventy-nine pounds; but in 1685, the imports were twelve thousand and seventy. The rate of increase in its use in England, is shown by the following table; which, for the year 1839—supposing none to be exported to the continent—is nearly an average of two pounds avoirdupois for each individual:

1711,	141,995	1810,	19,093,244
1735,	1,380,199	1820,	22,452,050
1750,	2,114,922	1830,	30,047,078
1760,	2,298,613	1834,	28,347,300
1770,	7,723,538	1837,	36,315,000
1780,	5,588,315	1838,	36,416,266
1790,	14,693,299	1839,	40,678,666
1800,	20,358,702		

The heavy export charges on tea in Canton, combined with other necessary ones, of freight, commission, insurance, &c. and the duty of 2*s.* 1*d.* per pound in England, make the price to the consumer in some hundred per cent. above the price in its native hills of Wooe; and although the penalty of adulterating this article is severe, it is not remarkable that this system of roguery is practised in England, to a great extent.

Next to the English, the Dutch are probably the greatest tea-drinkers in Europe; the consumption being about two millions eight hundred thousand pounds, annually. The tea consumed in Germany is entered at the port of Hamburg, and amounts to about two millions of pounds. The French are not a tea-drinking nation, being exceedingly partial to coffee, and claret wine, which they prefer to other kinds of beverage. In 1832, the consumption did not exceed two hundred and fifty thousand pounds; its use, however, has considerably increased since that period. The Russians consume great quantities of tea. It is brought overland, by the way of Kiakhta and Tartary. In 1832, the imports are said to have been six millions four hundred and sixty-one thousand and sixty-four pounds. The tea-drinkers in Russia, therefore, possess a great advantage over the other parts of Europe; for it is well known that this herb loses half its excellence, its aroma, during the long passage round the Cape of Good Hope. The tea in St. Petersburgh is a beverage altogether different from the tea used in England or America; it resembles, in flavor, the grateful beverage used by the Chinese. A large quantity of tea is consumed in the United States. Its consumption has gradually increased, since the revolution; and at this time, there are few families who entirely eschew its use. In 1834, upwards of eighteen millions of pounds were imported into this country; but nearly a third part of that amount was subsequently exported to Europe, or South America. The duties on this article were taken off in 1833, on the principle that it was an article of commerce, the introduction of which did not interfere with American manufactures. At this time, it is probable that twelve millions of pounds are consumed annually, or at the average rate of three-quarters of a pound to each person.

According to the most authentic data, the annual amount of tea exported from China to Europe, has, for some years, averaged between sixty and sixty-five millions of pounds. In 1837, there were fifty-six millions seven hundred and fifty-one thousand one hundred and thirty-three pounds exported in British and American vessels, at the cost of nineteen millions nine hundred and twenty-eight thousand and fifty-two dollars; in 1838, only fifty-two millions two hundred and two thousand five hundred and thirty-three pounds were exported by the same nations, at an invoice cost of thirteen millions five hundred and thirty-five thousand and twenty-six dollars.

The demand for tea being so great in Canton, it is not surprising that the Chinese sometimes adulterate it with the dried leaves of other plants. It is thought that a species of the *Camellia* is sometimes used for this purpose; as in many points it resembles the true leaf, in appearance, and in qualities; it is cultivated in the same regions; and both are called *cha*, by the Chinese. It is also said that the tea dealers in Canton sometimes stimulate the finer kinds by chemical agents, and resort to unfair attempts to increase the weight. Great care, however, is taken by the Hong merchants, to guard against any deception in this article; and cases of fraud are much less frequent than might reasonably be expected.

Tea, of course, is the favorite beverage in China. The Chinese drink the simple infusion; and so common a beverage is it, that in the poorest houses, a pot is usually kept standing to quench thirst; and if a guest is not presented with a cup of tea, it is, ten to one, a designed omission, as it is in Turkey not to offer a dish of coffee. Our mode of drinking tea, with the addition of milk and sugar, while it may sometimes conceal the unpleasant taste of bad tea, in a great measure destroys the delicious aroma and delicate flavor of the finest teas, and renders them comparatively insipid. The taste of our tea would probably be improved by covering the cup until the liquor is drank, as is the case among the Chinese; also, among the Brazilians and Portuguese, when partaking of their favorite *mate*.

It is said that few nations use tea more universally than the Japanese; and none have it of a more delicate flavor, or take more pains in curing it. It is cultivated in most parts of the country; and as in China, the spots usually selected for it are on the acclivities of hills; it is sometimes planted in hedge-rows, but the care taken of it is none the less. The most celebrated, is the *Udzi cha*, so called from the hills where it is cultivated; it is cured with extraordinary care. The Japanese sometimes triturate the cured leaves to a powder, and pour hot water upon them when lying on a sieve-like dish, and drink the infusion as it runs off; but this is not a common mode of using it; being, as we understand, chiefly confined to marriage ceremonies.

Various attempts have been made to cultivate the tea plant, in other places than in China; but they have, until lately, proved generally unsuccessful. Attempts have been made in Penang, Martinico, St. Helena, Florida, and Brazil; but the undertakings were subsequently abandoned. In Brazil, sanguine hopes were entertained of success, and heavy initiatory expenses incurred; but the whole has sunk into comparative neglect, leaving a few hot-house shrubs to tell the tale of their exile. These disappointments may all be ascribed to various opposing causes—as difference of climate, and unfitness of soil, excess of heat and moisture—and above all, ignorance of the manipulations in curing the leaf—combining to produce the result.

The Dutch have lately made vigorous attempts to introduce the cultivation of the tea plant into the island of Java. They have wisely availed themselves of the advice and assistance of the Chinese, settled on the island; and complete success promises to crown the undertaking. It is exclusively grown in Leaok, a varied country, where seem mingled together mountains and valleys, hills and vales; where nature has lavished her blessings with a liberal hand; and where the temperature is moderate, ranging from 55 to 75 or 80 degrees of Fahrenheit. A number of cargoes have already been conveyed from Java to Amsterdam.

The East India Company have already met with success in cultivating the tea plant in Upper Assam, where the plant is indigenous. Large lots have already been imported into England; and the first sale took place in April, 1839. It brought a high price; but its flavor being smoky, and strong, was greatly inferior to the teas imported from Canton. This was supposed to be owing to want of skill in curing it; and it was confidently said that it would be greatly improved. The tea plant has also been discovered, growing wild, among the Neilgherry hills, in India.

This plant is cultivated in hot-houses, in this country and in Europe. The first living plants brought to Europe, were introduced, after several unsuccessful attempts, by the celebrated Linnæus. They were brought to Upsal, in 1763. It is said that they may be cultivated in a loamy soil, or in loam and peat, well drained, and do not need a fire heat. They are increased by layings or cuttings of the young branches, when the seeds begin to ripen. The treatment, in almost all respects, resembles that of the camellia; but the tea is not so well naturalized as the former; nor is its flower so great a favorite with florists. The green tea plant, being hardier than the other, is more frequently met with in hot-houses; and in England, it flourishes the whole year, in the open air.

From the Philadelphia Ledger.

FASHIONS FOR DECEMBER—A HIT AT THE LADIES.

The fashions for this month are important. They have caused us a great deal of consideration, and will, of course, be followed by all who pretend to taste, fashion, and style.

The ladies being fine, hearty, robust, and of sound constitution, may go very thinly clad during this month. They should not put on any extra under garments, which only tend to destroy the beauty of the figure. They must wear silk stockings, and on no account, how sloppy soever the streets may be, wear anything but the thinnest of pumps. Double-soled shoes, whose only utility consists in keeping the feet dry, must not be thought of; and French clogs are not to be endured for a moment. The beauty of the foot must, on no account, be sacrificed to the weather. At this time, the dry goods merchants expose in their stores Canton and other flannels. Ladies must not be induced, by these temptations, to spoil their figures with flannel petticoats. The article is only introduced into the market for the use of Quakeresses, who study vulgar comfort, and care nothing for fashion. It is quite sufficient to say that these people wear worsted stockings and thick shoes.

The other fashions are short, silk dresses, with velvet short cloaks of the night-gown fashion, made more for show than service, and velvet bonnets which cover only half the head—crimson linings are the rage.

Gentlemen being weak, delicate, and particularly liable to consumption, may do what they always have done—take care of themselves. They may wear cork-soled boots, and strong, stout overcoats, of the pattern of the time of George II. lined and quilted.

It is only the ladies who are privileged and enjoined to set the weather at defiance. It is a beautiful idea. It shows at once the superior courage of the female sex, which many have doubted. Men dare not do it.

THOUGHT AND ACTION.

Extracted from a speech in the Massachusetts State House, by Ellis Gray Loring.

Thought is elder than action; and when the public mind is sufficiently prepared, by discussion, the legitimate action follows, of course. We have just the means in our hands that have effected all reformations. Look at the first awakening of public sentiment in regard to the African slave trade. The whole world was slumbering over its enormities. Even religion tolerated it. The great and good John Newton wrote home from the coast of Africa, while pursuing this business, which is now outlawed as piracy, that he had been enjoying sweet seasons with his God! A quiet student in a university was appointed to write a theme; and the subject given him for his task, by his professor, was the African slave trade. He studied the subject; began to collect matter; his soul kindled at the enormities that met him; he imparted his knowledge and poured forth his feelings into kindred bosoms. The advocates of the abolition of the slave trade, among his humble friends, at length numbered twelve. The great men, the rulers, the "wise and prudent," stood aloof; the commercial interests, the religion of the nation,—every thing seemed against them. But they persevered, in the midst of obloquy and opposition;—they talked, they wrote, they went on "conquering and to conquer." After a twenty years conflict, the slave trade was overthrown. That student was THOMAS CLARKSON. Posterity looks upon such men and deeds in a vastly different light from cotemporaries. Five or six years ago, a poor and solitary individual of the working class came among us, with nothing to depend upon but his God, and the native powers which God gave him. He raised the thrilling cry of immediate emancipation. His encouragement was at first small indeed. But the grand, the true, the vital idea of immediate freedom to the slave, burned bright within him and supported him. He, too, at length, had his twelve associates, and the first anti-slavery society was formed. From this small beginning, and owing mainly, I believe, under God, to the clear vision, the purity of character, the energy, and the intrepidity of that individual, our cause has advanced. Yet, the individual who started this mighty movement, is rejected and scorned by the great and little vulgar of our day. No matter. Posterity will do justice to the name of WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

A CURIOUS LAW SUIT.

Galignani, whose "feathered Mercury" chronicles more of the quaint and eccentric features of the Iris colored nation, than any other journal of its time, relates a remarkable case at law growing out of a no less singular circumstance. It seems that not long ago, a citizen of Nantz, (France,) who was thought to be dead, after the expiration of a proper time was placed in his coffin for interment. The man was in a trance, however, and gave signs of life, so soon as the loud "De Profundis" was chanted at his intended funeral. The apparent resuscitation was complete, and he finally recovered to receive, as says a French journal, "the sincere felicitations of his friends, and the *extra*-sincere ones of his heirs." But, now, the Curé who superintended the funeral ceremony, presents a demand of 219 francs for the expenses of the same, which the resuscitated gentleman disputes, considering it rather hard to pay such a sum for a funeral that did not take place; refusing to honor the Curé's bill, on the ground that he had not been buried, and that if the Curé thought he had, he had better apply to those who had commanded the ceremony. The Curé, on the other hand, declares that if the interment had not taken place, it was not his fault, and that, therefore, as he had prepared all matters necessary for its proper execution, he should persist in his demand. So the matter rests at present. The "dead alive" considers, no doubt, that he has gone through almost the horrors of martyrdom in such coffin incarceration, and that having escaped "that bourne from which no traveller returns," *he* ought to be paid for "keeping the peace," without trial by judge or jury. The expenses for which the money is demanded by the Curé certainly are not *funeral* expenses. The man came to life again, and the event in our opinion was—a *resurrection*. "The law," however, as an old man once said, "is very baffling."

Since writing the above, we find an account of a lady who broke the cerements of the grave in our own country, though we do not discover that there is likely to be a law case out of the appalling circumstance. The facts are given in the Portland American as follows: A married woman of Fishlake township, Maine, beyond the meridian of life, and whose name is Ann Wrath, had been ill for some time, and on Thursday, the 4th ultimo, her friends and family assembled round her, and took their last mournful farewell. She appeared to expire about five o'clock that afternoon. The ceremonies of laying out the dead were duly performed, the bandages were placed beneath her chin to her head, and every preparation was made for the solemn rites of the burial ground. The sexton tolled the bell; and at half past eight o'clock, some minutes before his work was accomplished, she raised her head in astonishment, and was amazed to find that she was able to partake of the refreshments for her funeral.—*Boston Transcript.*

HIGHLAND FIDELITY.

The generous self-devotion of Roderic Mackenzie has been often recited. This young man who had sought concealment among the mountains of Rosshire, after the battle of Culloden, was surprised by a party of soldiers, sent in pursuit of Charles Edward. His age, his figure, his air, deceived the military so completely, that they were going to secure him, in belief that they had got hold of the prince. MacKenzie perceived their mistake, and with great fortitude and presence of mind, instantly resolved to render it useful to his master. He drew his sword, and the courage with which he defended himself, satisfied these soldiers that he could be no other than the pretender. One of them fired at him; Mackenzie fell, and his last breath exclaimed, "You have killed your prince!" This generous sacrifice suspended for a time all pursuit, and afforded an opportunity for the unfortunate Charles to escape from the hands of his enemies. It is well known that Kennedy, who frequently exposed his life to save that of the prince just named, and who, though mean and poor despised the reward of $30,000 which was offered for the person, dead, or alive, of the royal fugitive, was afterwards hanged at Inverness for stealing a cow. A little before his execution, he pulled off his bonnet, and rendered hearty thanks to God, "that he had never proved false to engagements of any kind, that he had never injured a poor man, and never refused to share whatever he had with the indigent and the stranger."

CHRIST, THE BELIEVER'S PILOT.

I have often seen young and unskillful persons sitting in a little boat, when every little wave sporting about the sides of the vessel, and every motion and dancing of the barge semed a danger, and made them cling fast upon their fellows; and yet all the while they were as safe as if they sat under a tree, while the gentle breeze shaked the leaves into a refreshing and cooling shade; and the unskillful and inexperienced Christian shrieks out whenever his vessel shakes, thinking it always a danger, that the watery pavement is not stable and resident like a rock; and yet all his danger is in himself, none at all without; for he is indeed moving upon the waters, but fastened to a rock. Faith is his foundation, and hope is his anchor, and death is his harbour, and Christ is his pilot, and heaven is his country; and all the evils of poverty, or affronts of tribunals and evil judges, of fears and sad apprehensions, are but like the loud wind blowing from the right point, they make a noise and drive faster to the harbor; and if we do not leave the ship, and jump into the sea; quit the interests of religion, and run to the securities of the world; cut our cables, and dissolve our hopes; grow impatient, and hug a wave, and die in its embraces—we are safe at sea; safer in a storm which God sends us, than in a calm, when we are befriended with the world.—*Jeremy Taylor.*

Peach-Orchard Coal, $5 50 per Ton.

WM. P. POWELL, 61 Cherry street, will furnish at the lowest market prices, a superior quality of Peach-Orchard, Schuylkill, Lehigh, Lackawana, and Liverpool Coals. ☞ Orders through the Post Office, and otherwise, if left at either of the following places, will be thankfully received, and promptly attended to,

At 143 Nassau street; 61 Cherry street; Office of People's Press, 9 Spruce street.

New-York, September 29, 1842.

REELED SILK FOR SALE.

43 lbs reeled by Mrs. McLanahan and suitable for sewing silk, and 20 lbs. heavy for saddlers will be sold *low for cash* or city acceptances. Apply by letter, to

EDWARD M. DAVIS,

Dec. 15. tf Philadelphia.

Health, Quiet, and Comfort!!

THE Graham House, 63 Barclay street, New-York proffers advantages to strangers stopping a few days or weeks in the city, such as are rarely offered. It is eligibly located, on a clean and airy street, very near the business part of the city, and in the immediate vicinity of the principal steamboat landings. Its apartments are convenient and neat, while its table is supplied with the best vegetables and fruits that can be procured, excluding, entirely, animal food, and stimulants of all kinds. Charges moderate, and every effort made to render boarders comfortable. Shower baths free. Remember, 63. New-York, October 20, 1842. 6m

FREE LABOR BOOT AND SHOE STORE.

Wholesale and Retail.

THE subscriber notifies his friends and the public generally, that he keeps constantly on hand, at the most reasonable prices, a large assortment of WOMEN'S and CHILDREN'S BOOTS AND SHOES, of every description, and best materials, and entirely free from the contamination of slave labor.

COUNTRY MERCHANTS will do well to call and examine for themselves, before purchasing elsewhere.

All orders punctually executed, at the shortest notice.

JAMES WILLIS,

No. 241 Arch street, one door below 7th

Philadelphia, June 16, 1842. p.—6m.

Popular English Periodicals,

Republished in New-York

LONDON, QUARTERLY, EDINBURGH, FOREIGN,

AND

WESTMINSTER REVIEWS:

AND

THE DUBLIN UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE;

FULL OF THE FUN OF OULD IRELAND.

Blackwood's and the Metropolitan MAGAZINES;

AND

BENTLEY'S MISCELLANY.

☞ The above periodicals continue to be published at *one-third the price of the English edition*, with the same fidelity which has been universally acknowledged to characterize their execution. They are exact reprints of the originals, and all the illustrations, however numerous, are given in almost every instance. The publisher wishes it to be distinctly understood, that these periodicals are delivered to the subscribers in the principal cities of the Union, *free of postage, or other incidental expense*; the Magazines within the same month of their publication in England, and the Reviews immediately afterwards, with the utmost despatch.

TERMS.—The numbers of each work are issued separately, and are printed with good type on a large octavo page, and on paper of a superior quality. Blackwood's Magazine and Bentley's Miscellany, are *fac similes* of the original works, and the size of the Metropolitan Magazine, and the Reviews differs very little from the European editions, and their execution is quite